

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DEBATE ON ADMISSION OF RED CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, one of the more knowledgeable persons in our country concerning the Far East, particularly Red China, is the Reverend David C. Head. I have had the pleasure of many meetings with him and know well his determination to set the record straight concerning the Communist threat to the free world from both the Soviet Union and Red China.

The Reverend Mr. Head is the author of "Communist Blueprint for World Conquest," published earlier this year by the Clergymen's Committee on China, Inc. This distinguished group, consisting of members of the clergy from many religious bodies of our country, has consistently opposed the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

With the coming debate on this subject before the United Nations, the Reverend Mr. Head's recent pamphlet, titled "The Debate on the Admission of Red China to the U.N.," published by the Clergymen's Committee on China, Inc., is extremely timely and very valuable in studying the issues involved.

As a member of the Steering Committee of the Committee of One Million, which is totally opposed to the admission of Red China under its present leadership, attitude, and direction, I welcome this added valuable material.

I ask unanimous consent that the pamphlet be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEBATE ON THE ADMISSION OF RED CHINA TO THE U.N.

(By David C. Head)

FOREWORD

In 1966, the Clergymen's Committee on China was organized by the late Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Chairman of the Board of *Christian Herald* magazine. The organization's first public action was the polling of a cross-section of American Protestant clergymen to determine their feelings concerning the United States' relations with Communist China. More than thirty thousand clergymen completed the poll. Of those polled, 71.4% were opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations or United States' recognition of Peking; 93.7% were opposed to satisfying Communist China's conditions for joining the United Nations by expelling the Republic of China from the world organization.

The poll was initiated in lieu of a statement by the National Council of Churches in favor of Communist China's admission with the implication that this resolution was reflecting the views of approximately 40 million Protestants. The poll proved that, on the contrary, the General Board of the National

Council of Churches had either ignored the opinion of the great majority of its constituency or it had willfully, or by other serious error in judgment, misrepresented their true views.

In 1968, the National Council of Churches again issued an official policy statement in favor of Communist China by advocating that the United States "... acknowledge that [Red] China has legitimate interests in Asia and that [Red] China will exert a significant influence in the region." The Clergyman's Committee on China replied to this with "An Open Letter to American Protestant Clergymen" which contained a detailed explanation of why such a stand was erroneous.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A fading hope or a future promise

"We the peoples of the United Nations determine to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war..." With these words the Charter of the United Nations begins. It is the essence of all the manifold obligations assumed by the members of the United Nations. Each nation that becomes a member of this world body subscribes to the same principle that President Nixon has adopted as a guideline for United States foreign policy, namely, the pursuit of peace.

No country in the modern world can live by itself, concerned solely with its own development. Every nation has to shape its own future by sharing its destiny with others and, consequently, is exposed to the same dangers and influences. The fate of other nations, even if not our direct responsibility, is nevertheless connected with and reflected in our own destiny. The true purpose of the United Nations is found in its basic conception of being the balance between nations holding opposing ideologies. It was supposed to be the scale of world justice. Its supporters believe it to be the place where wrong is turned to right and war is turned to peace. In its ultimate purpose, its founders envisioned the United Nations to be the guide and mediator for the family of man.

It has often been said that the United Nations is the world's only hope. This expectation has frequently been disappointed, and the stress has necessarily to be on the word "only," since experience has shown that the United Nations, in the 25 years of its existence, has often been sadly inadequate. Yet, rightly or wrongly, many cling to the promises of this world organization if only for the reason that they believe there is no other hope. The United Nations' effectiveness has not been challenged by any major world wars but it has failed to prevent limited wars, and the actual deterrent to war has been the nuclear threat of a major involvement, rather than the peace-keeping influence of the United Nations. Its major failure, however, has been that it has not effected any closer cooperation and understanding between the Communist and the Free World. The gigantic struggle between totalitarianism and freedom has never been more intense than it is right now. The area of combat is not just Vietnam, or Laos, or Cambodia. It is all of Asia, it is Europe, it is certainly the Middle East, it is Africa, it is South America, and it is the United States of America. In Vietnam, the battle for survival of one ideology over the other is a real one, a visible one, daily accounted for by so many deaths on either side. Here at home and elsewhere, the destructive effects on mind and body, the hatred and division this struggle produces cannot so easily be defined and measured by so many victims or victors. All major tensions, wars and war-like actions, with the exception of the Middle

Eastern situation, now having changed into the same confrontation, have been crated through international Communism. It is the defeat of Communism, not its accommodation, that would remove the cause for confrontation in the future. The United Nations has not checked the advancement of Communism, nor has it been able to interfere in communist subversive activities. This means that it has been ineffective in preserving the rights of self-determination of member states.

The obligations assumed by member nations of the United Nations, the principles and purposes as laid down in the Charter, and the daily issues on the agenda of the Assembly are all moral issues. The United Nations represents moral authority. Self-determination and human rights are moral issues. In the role of mediator, the United Nations, as a moral force, is confronted with an entirely different code of ethics in dealing with the two ideological blocs, or with the lack of such ethics in communist-dominated countries represented in the United Nations. Lenin gave the following interpretation and guideline for communist ethics by saying:

"But is there such a thing as Communist ethics? ... Of course, there is. ... In what sense do we repudiate ethics and morality? In the sense that they were preached by the bourgeoisie, who declared that ethics were God's commandments. We ... do not believe in God. ... We say that our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. ... We say: Morality is that which serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the toilers around the proletariat, which is creating a new Communist society. ... For the Communist, morality consists entirely of compact united discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters."¹

While the United Nations, in its impartiality, will not condemn the immorality of Communism as such, it should nevertheless strive to preserve the rights of people where these rights still exist and pursue their reinstatement where they have been lost. As a member state of the United Nations, the United States has the obligation to insist that its principles and purposes are carried out. In addition, we bear a high responsibility in our foreign policy decisions as a nation to which other countries look for leadership. The United States' vote for or against admission of Red China to the United Nations represents the key vote for others to follow and it therefore means immeasurably more than just a change in our foreign policy. It is the crucial vote for justice or injustice.

We are a republic and the power is in the hands of everyone of us—which means that, in our role as a leading nation, everyone of us should strive for and obtain a broad understanding of public issues and the problems confronting us. The final actions of our government are based on the decisions every single American is making. In turn, our government, in dealing with communist nations, is faced with the willful decisions of a small group of their leaders who manipulate their peoples' destinies to reach their own aims. Only if this inequality in human rights can be overcome and the freedom to elect leaders through the individual's vote in all countries is made possible, can unified measurement be applied and can the United Nations succeed. So far, the United Nations is sacrificing a great deal of its effectiveness through endless vetoes of the Soviet Union. What would happen if the communist power bloc is fur-

Footnotes at end of article.

ther increased? Could it not be assumed that the remainder of its already limited ability to cope with world problems would lead to increased apathy, a diminution of moral stature, and eventual destruction?

19TH VOTE ON COMMUNIST CHINA'S ADMISSION *A vote comparison*

The 24th session of the United Nations General Assembly convened on November 11, 1969, represented the 19th time that the admission of Communist China was voted upon, following the Albanian draft resolution seeking to expel the Republic of China and seat in its place Communist China. The resolution was defeated by a vote of 56 against, 48 in favor, with 21 abstentions and one member absent. The vote on the same resolution in 1968 was 58 to 44, with 23 abstentions. In 1967, it was 58-45-17; in 1966: 57-46-17; and in 1965: 47-47-20.

The changes between the previous vote in 1968 compared with the vote in 1969 consisted of the following: Four nations, Ghana, Libya, Mauritius, and Nigeria, all of whom abstained last year, cast their votes for Communist China. Belgium, Chile, and Italy, who had voted against admission in 1968, shifted to abstention. Senegal, who abstained in 1968, this time voted against admission.

This vote comparison shows a weakening of the United Nations stand on the issue and it would be wrong to regard the situation with complacency just because the vote was passed for the 19th time in favor of the Republic of China.

ADMISSION MEANS ACCOMMODATIONS

A summary of reasons why Peking cannot be granted recognition by the United Nations

Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China and Chairman of the Chinese Delegation to the 24th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, in his statement on the representation of China in the United Nations before the 1,798th Plenary Meeting on November 3, 1969, gave an exhaustive summary of the reasons why Communist China should be rejected as a member nation:

"Those who champion the Chinese Communist cause have been in the habit of arguing that to bar the Communist regime from United Nations membership is to deprive the 700 million Chinese people of their representation in the world organization. It is unrealistic, they maintain, to ignore the existence of a quarter of the world's population.

"This, it seems to me, is a spurious argument. No one ignores the existence of 700 million Chinese people. In fact, it is precisely because the interests of the 700 million people should not be ignored that the seal of international approval must be withheld from a regime which has committed so many heinous crimes against them, which has deprived them of every freedom, and which has denied them even the most elementary of human rights.

"The Chinese people and the Communist regime, far from being one and the same, are in fact distinct and mutually hostile entities. The interests of the Chinese people and those of the Communist regime are different and contradictory. The Communist regime cannot, therefore, represent the Chinese people; it represents only a tiny minority . . . the Chinese Communist Party, whose total membership does not exceed two per cent of the population of China. Now, even this tiny minority is torn by power struggles. The large-scale purges of the past three years have failed to enable Mao Tse-tung to consolidate his authority over his rivals, whose latent influence is still a factor to reckon with. Small wonder the official Communist press is filled with unabashed appeals for unity and vigilance in the face of 'internal enemies.' This can be explained only by an acute sense of insecurity.

"Armed clashes have been reported in a large number of provinces. Anti-Mao and anti-Communist forces have been gathering strength and momentum. Even more pernicious than all this is the prevalence of what Peking calls 'anarchism,' the manifestations of which are a general breakdown of discipline and widespread resistance to authority of any kind. The so-called revolutionary committees in the provinces continue to be an unstable coalition of divergent elements dominated by the military. Party cadre are still paralyzed by the fear of another purge. Every contest of power on the upper levels sends a tremor of fright through the entire structure. Below the level of the Central Committee, the Communist Party remains shattered and shadowy. All in all, it may be said that the regime has lost its effective control over a large part of the mainland. The reason is not far to seek. Basically, Communism and the cultural tradition of the Chinese people are incompatible. . . .

"But, it is argued, the interests of world peace require the presence of Peking in the United Nations. There is, it seems . . . a touch of disingenuousness about this argument. It is difficult to believe that a regime dedicated to reshaping the world by force of arms and firmly convinced of the inevitability of war can contribute to the cause of world peace.

"For the Chinese Communists, this exaltation of force and violence is a basic article of faith. It is the central thesis of the so-called 'Mao Tse-tung Thought.' It has been written into the new Party Constitution adopted at the Ninth Party Congress in April this year. 'War,' according to Mao Tse-tung, 'is the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions, when they have developed to a certain stage, between classes, nations, states, or political groups. . . . It is by means of war that 'imperialism headed by the United States' and 'modern revisionism with the Soviet Union at its center' must be eventually overthrown. It is by means of war that Peking, as Lin Pao has made it abundantly clear in his political report to the Ninth Party Congress, intends to bring about the victory of Maoism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. . . .

"It is a matter of record that since 1949 the Chinese Communist regime has participated in a number of military adventures, either directly or by proxy. It played a leading part in the Korean war. It attacked India in 1962 and Sikkim in 1965. Its role in the war in Vietnam needs no elaboration. All this suggests that Mao's doctrine of war and violence must be taken seriously. . . .

"Chinese Communist representatives abroad are not interested in promoting friendly relations with the governments to which they are accredited; their primary function is the propagation of subversive ideas.

"It is thus clear that the Chinese Communists negate all the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and reject the ideals of peace and progress toward which the world community has been striving. To seat them in the United Nations would be to encourage aggression by rewarding the aggressor, to undermine the rule of law in international relations and to undercut whatever claim the United Nations may have to being a moral force in the present-day world. . . .

"Weariness with the recurrent conflict of our times and fear of nuclear war have engendered in the minds of men a yearning for normalcy and a craving for final and formal settlements. Some seem ready to buy peace at any price. . . . Through United Nations membership, so the argument goes, the Chinese Communists will learn the art of compromise and the necessity of conforming to established standards of international conduct. . . .

"Let no one forget that the most important condition for membership is not the possession of nuclear bombs but 'peace-loving.' Let us, therefore, be true to our commitment to principles and purposes of the Charter. Let us refuse to be intimidated by Peking's nuclear weapons." 2

"RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND FOR FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS FOR ALL"

The absence of fundamental freedoms under Mao's regime is against the basic principles of the United Nations

"Respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all" is the basic purpose and principle of the United Nations. Logically, a nation to be eligible to be a member of the United Nations should be able to demonstrate respect for human rights and freedom within its own state and apply it within its own regime in order to be seated in a world organization that works toward this purpose and judges other nations under this principle.

Not even the most convincing apologist could contend that there exists any fundamental freedom under Mao's reign. In the name of class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Chinese Communist regime has existed through suppression, liquidation, purges, and revolutionary actions and measures. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which started at the end of 1965, and the Red Guard Movement showed that Mao Tse-tung had adversaries in mainland China, but it also showed that no elements exerting any influence contrary to Mao's "thoughts" are permitted to exist. Unleashed by Mao Tse-tung to reestablish and assure his primacy and to more firmly cement his own brand of Communism, the movement was intended to wipe out the last vestiges of dissidents and revisionism, and to reactivate revolutionary militancy. But foremost, it was initiated to liquidate and purge all anti-Mao, anti-Party, and anti-Socialism elements.

In effect, the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was an internal power struggle within the hierarchies of the Party, army, and government. It was directed against the "bourgeoisie," but it was also final attack on all ancient Chinese tradition, implemented through a wave of vandalism in which valuable art treasures and books were smashed and burned. It was the destruction of the Chinese heritage. Would this be the will of the people? Could anybody interpret this as anything but the most blatant interference with the rights of the individual?

Dr. Stephen Pan and Father Raymond de Jaeger summed up the result of the Red Guard Movement as follows:

"(1) In trying to destroy the Old World and create a New World they have succeeded to some extent in eradicating much of the ancient Chinese cultural heritage. But they have not and cannot create a new culture worth keeping, or acceptable to the Chinese.

"(2) Outwardly, the Cultural Revolution aims at the crushing of landlords, rich peasants, bad elements, and anti-revolutionary elements. No one knows exactly how many of these people have been killed by the Red Guards, or compelled to commit suicide. But the most clear and conspicuous effect of this wholesale persecution has been the annihilation of great numbers of Party leaders, intellectuals, educators, and writers.

"(3) A chaotic state of terror and 'internal strife,' as Lin Piao recently admitted, exists in present day China. The nation has become a bloody field of struggle between rightist and leftist youths, between various factions of the Red Guards, and between the Red Guards and the workers, peasants and even soldiers.

"(4) An atmosphere of hatred, suspicion, and hostility exists which has permeated

workers, peasants, and the Red Guards. Widespread as it is, it will probably involve the armed forces to a large degree.

"(5) The gigantic scale of cruelty and political purges is greater today in mainland China than it ever was in the Soviet Union under Stalin. The methods used by Party members against each other are more subtle than those methods employed by Stalin.

"(6) The Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the Red Guards have made enemies all over the world. Their excesses have resulted in unfavorable reactions and criticism from Communists and non-Communists alike. The Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations are today more critical of the Red Guards than of the Free World, including the United States and the United Kingdom.

"(7) The great and intensified turmoil in continental China has proved how erroneous was the assertion made by many of the American 'China experts' that Communist China is a stable nation and the time is ripe for the United States to align herself with Peking."

What happens if a tyrant is appeased? Will he become less of a totalitarian if his power is enhanced? Will it turn him into a benevolent and just leader of his people when he receives encouragement and support in his oppressive domination? The twentieth century has had its ample share of dictators and should have gathered profuse experience in understanding that denial of reality will lead to frightful disaster and that giving concessions as a sign of American good faith is a futile attempt at containment of totalitarianism.

China scholars have estimated that more than 25 million Chinese were purged as a result of the communist conquest of mainland China. Added to this stupendous figure have to be the victims of continuous purges and the "Cultural Revolution." The blood of these countless martyrs clings to the hands of those same leaders that we would honor through recognition and that we would embrace in a world body that represents human rights, justice, and peace. To not regard men like Mao Tse-tung, Lin Biao, and Chou En-lai as ruthless dictators would mean consent to ruthlessness and slaughter. This in itself should be sufficient reason for not granting these oppressors the dignity of belonging to an organization that stands for liberty of all mankind. Men who through words and deeds do not recognize human rights for their own people cannot themselves, or through those they delegate as their representatives, be made judges over the destiny of man.

THE PRINCIPLE OF UNIVERSALITY

The United Nations charter is based on the principle of selectivity, not on universality

Advocates for admission of Communist China to the United Nations base their point of view on the "principle of universality," regardless of the fact there is no provision in the United Nations Charter that would indicate eligibility for admission under this conception. Relevant articles in the U.N. Charter are all based on "selectivity," and not on automatic universality.

The specific articles are as follows:

Chapter I, Article 1

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

"2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

"3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

"4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

Chapter I, Article 2

"Clause 3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice are not endangered.

"Clause 4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

Chapter II, Article 4

"Clause 1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

Article 5

"A Member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council."

Article 6

"A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Thus, the Charter clearly is based on the principle of selectivity, not universality or automatic universality. Article 4 states the condition for membership; Article 5 states the provision for suspension from membership; and Article 6 provides for the expulsion of a member persistently violating the Principles of the Charter. Under the latter, Red China would immediately be eligible for expulsion if it was a member. Because of the aggressive acts of the Chinese Communist regime in the Korean War and its aggression against its neighbors, it has been branded as an aggressor. The Korean conflict was the first and most important effort of the United Nations to halt aggression through collective action in the United Nations. For Communist China, against whom the effort of the United Nations was directed, to be seated in the United Nations while still unpurged of its aggression and of defying the will of the United Nations in Korea, would amount to a confession of failure on the part of the United Nations and would greatly reduce the prospects for future successful action by the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of world peace would be vitiated.

While it would be an ideal situation if the United Nations could be transformed into a universal organization—under world conditions that presently do not exist—it would, under the present Charter, be a violation of the stipulations contained therein to apply the universality principle. Furthermore, by admitting a state which has delivered no proof that it is willing to abide by the jurisdiction of the United Nations and adjust its

conduct in keeping with the laws of the United Nations, but actually expresses its intention to change the aims and image of this organization, would be a fatal weakening of the United Nations. In fact, any country scrupulously holding to the obligations under the Charter cannot in good conscience vote for the admission of Communist China. Such country does not only disregard honoring the Charter but votes in favor of injustice by voting for the expulsion of a member state, the Republic of China.

Furthermore, Communist China has never officially applied for admission to the United Nations, and by their own pronouncements the Chinese leaders have admitted that they are neither prepared to abide by the principles of the United Nations nor to accept the obligations and duties embedded in such a membership. They have repeatedly made statements relating to the changes that must be effected before Red China would even consider becoming a member of this organization. Premier Chou En-lai advocated the following for the United Nations:

"The United Nations must correct all of its mistakes of the past, and must be thoroughly reorganized and transformed.

If this goal is not reached, then the possibility will increase that a new revolutionary United Nations will be set up.

Also, if a vote for the admission of Red China would mean, or have as a consequence, the expulsion of the Republic of China, the universality principle which the pro-Communist China lobbyists advocate would thereby be defeated and would represent an inconsistent action. It would mean the expulsion of a nation that has strictly adhered to its obligations as a United Nations member and has displayed full, peaceful, and constructive responsibility within the world community. The expulsion of the Republic of China, however, is the first demand of Communist China. Here are the conditions as stated by Chen Yi, the Chinese Communist Premier, on September 29, 1965:

"1. The expulsion of the Republic of China from the U.N.

"2. The complete reorganization of the U.N.

"3. The withdrawal of the General Assembly resolution condemning Peking as an aggressor in the Korean conflict.

"4. The branding of the United States as an aggressor in that conflict."

The concept of universality was rejected by the majority of the participants of the San Francisco Conference 25 years ago who recognized the danger that admittance of aggressors would make aggression a global policy. Membership in the United Nations, thus, remains a privilege, not a right.

THE DEBATE ON REPRESENTATION

Less than 5 percent of the mainland Chinese are represented by the Mao regime

One of the most popular reasonings for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations is the contention that a country populated by close to a quarter of all mankind needs to be represented in the United Nations. The fault of this logic is, however, that the admission of Red China does not mean that 750 million Chinese will be represented; it means that a handful of communist tyrants will obtain an important voice. Moreover, these leaders are not chosen by the Chinese people they are supposed to represent as their legitimate and rightful mouthpiece. The Chinese people have been at war against the Peking decision-makers for 21 long years. The 750 million Chinese people would still be unrepresented, whereas the rightful representatives of the Chinese, now seated in the United Nations, would have to be expelled in order to accommodate communist demands. The result would only be that the Republic of China would be deprived of its just place among responsible nations.

TAIWAN'S POPULATION

Larger than that of 94 United Nations member nations

More than 13 million people live on the island of Taiwan, representing a larger population than that of 94 member nations of the United Nations. While nobody can deny that a true representation of nearly a quarter of the world's population is of the greatest importance for the Chinese as well as for the United Nations, it remains, nevertheless, a reality that under present conditions such a representation is not feasible. If the United Nations cannot help the Chinese people to regain their self-determination and liberty, it should at least constrain itself from giving aid to the enslavers of 750 million Chinese—and so should the United States of America.

TIME-SPAN OF COMMUNIST RULERSHIP

No reason for automatically legitimizing the Communists

Then there are those who contend that the communist rulers have been in power in mainland China since 1949 and that their control over such an extensive period of time makes them automatically legitimate. This reasoning would be to say that repetition of sin erases sin, or that the continuance of evil must be regarded through its persistence as goodness.

Again, history has given us enough examples that appeasement and accommodation may well prolong the life-span of dictators but that, in the end, justice will prevail. Hitler's control over Germany lasted an immeasurably shorter time than the Thousand-Year Reich he had proclaimed. Mussolini held total control over Italy and his regime was even briefer. Sukarno's control was broken after it had been paid for with the death of thousands upon thousands. Nkrumah was overthrown. The enslaving force and total effectiveness of Communism can, of course, not be minimized, but it can never become the cause for sanctioning injustice and brutal control and for withdrawing hope rather than extending it. Time does not make the destroyers of the heritage of the Chinese people their rightful representatives. Not only is the rigidly controlled communist dictatorship contrary to any freedom as we know and cherish it, it is also contrary to Chinese tradition which honors the rights and dignity of the individual.

Franz Michael, Associate Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies at the George Washington University, evaluated the prospects and consequences of a change in leadership in an address before the National Committee on United States-China Relations as follows:

"It is possible to imagine that Maoism will continue to prevail as it has heretofore. We have no parallel in the past for such forms of modern totalitarianism and we have no indications of organized resistance in mainland China. But no leader cult has so far survived the death of its leader; and even if he is given a life-span of 150 years by official Peking propaganda, Mao cannot last many more years. The question is, what will happen after Mao's death, or even earlier, with any weakening of his control. Will the military, the main tool of power today be able to hold things together or will the military itself remain unified? What political purpose, what ideology will be the cement that unifies a nation which has gone through such extraordinary trials? Can Maoist utopianism prevail under Lin Biao or another military leader? Can a Marxist-Leninist party make a comeback? This is what the Soviets hope and work for. . . .

"Basically, the decision can be expected to fall inside China and will be determined by the opposing social, political and military forces. But in an open situation, where decisions hang in the balance, outside action may contribute to and affect the outcome.

It is therefore of great importance that this situation be understood before any decision on policy with regard to mainland China is considered. It is not a question of establishing formal relations with China; with which force in China are relations to be established. And what effect may such relationship have on the outcome of the internal conflict in Communist China? Unless a clear decision to influence the power struggle is made—and this would be at best a risky business—the only possible attitude must be hands off. Any political involvement today appears unpredictable in outcome and an unnecessary limitation on future freedom of action. A recognition of "China," let alone her 750 million people, whom we would like to reach, . . . will be a recognition of Mao's new type of government and a move related to the internal power struggle. It may not even be acceptable to the Maoist regime, as indicated by the contemptuous treatment recently given to Canadian and Italian efforts to establish official diplomatic relations with Peking.

"There are of course, other reasons, which make it impractical to go beyond the present contacts and extend a friendly hand to Mao Tse-tung. It is utterly unrealistic to expect that we can reconcile such action with our existing responsibilities in the Far East. We have nothing to gain and much to lose in current support from Far Eastern nations if we abandon our commitments."

ISOLATION

Red China's isolation is a consequence of her own behavior

Pro-Communist China factions claim that the U.S. government is the cause of Red China's isolationist position. The truth is, of course, that Red China's diplomatic isolation is a consequence of her own behavior. This isolation, however, does not prevent her from inciting unrest in the world, particularly in Southeast Asia where she hopes eventually to gain full control.

This same faction argues that the United States would benefit by obtaining greater knowledge and understanding of Red China through closer diplomatic ties. It must be agreed that it would definitely be of the utmost benefit to the American people to gain a clearer conception of Communism and to strive for a more thorough education of the general public on this subject, but the advantages from a position of "peaceful co-operation" could, under present circumstances and with regard to the Vietnam War, where an indirect confrontation is taking place, be at best considered as one-sided. Red China has certainly enjoyed the closest co-operation and friendship with the Soviet Union and the understanding between these countries, if the same assumption that close contact solves all adversity is applied, should therefore be completely harmonious. However, if we are to believe the statements made by both countries about their current relationship, separation and estrangement have nevertheless developed. The causes for these adverse conditions are, according to Peking, the USSR's "peaceful coexistence" policy with the United States and, according to Moscow, heightened through Red China's belligerency. In other words, Peking challenges Moscow's "peaceful competition" policy and claims that it endangers the friendship between the two communist nations. She herself adheres to the proven method of militancy, subversion, and aggression in international conduct. By virtue of her ideology, Red China is incapable of proving that she is, or intends to be, a "peace-loving" nation and that she will refrain "in her international relations from the threat to use force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state," and thereby abide by the obligations embodied in the

United Nations Charter. By her own pronouncements she stands for all that is contrary to the "love for peace."

Pro-admission lobbyists furthermore claim that through admission the United States would help and hasten to break Red China's voluntary, or involuntary isolation and that it, thus would enable Peking to give valuable assistance in decisions and discussions of world affairs. Such an assumption does not, first of all, take into consideration the true reasons for her isolation. Communist China's isolation is indeed both voluntary and involuntary but not, as Peking apologists see it, through any fault of the United States government. Communist China's anxieties are not created through an antagonistic position of the United States but are deeply rooted in her inability to cope with her internal problems. They are caused by her national and revolutionary objectives which have led to clashes in her leadership and have resulted in a near complete halt in her international contacts. Opposing factions in Peking have never been unified enough to even come to a conclusion about whether closer relationships are desirable, or whether they wish to participate in international organizations such as the United Nations. It means that they are lacking a unanimous directive concerning their willingness to adhere to international law and abide by it. By rejecting, in fact, closer relations with powers outside as well as inside international Communism—however desirable these might be at times—the rulers in Peking have shown the world that they refuse to recognize international law and conduct. It is only reasonable to assume, therefore, that they inevitably would face extreme difficulties in their dealings within a world organization and that their judgment in affairs of the world would be less than valuable.

Foremost, it is their preoccupation with their internal turmoil and difficulties that prevents any clear-cut formulation of foreign policy. It is, in the long run, not a question of how we will fit Red China into the international community but how Red China will, in the future, shape her own destiny. Which group in Communist China, if any, should be regarded as the true representative of the people? There are the (1) Mao Tse-tung faction—the ideology faction; (2) the Liu Shao-chi (or Chen Yi, or Chou En-lai) faction—the bureaucracy faction; and (3) the PLA (Peoples' Liberation Army)—the professional military faction. Mao Tse-tung's reason for initiating the "Cultural Revolution" was to rid himself of certain bureaucratic leadership elements opposed to his policies. He succeeded in training a revolutionary generation, but it is still questionable if he will be successful in handling these revolutionary elements to his own advantage and equally uncertain if the military will continue to support him. It is exactly this uncertain, unresolved situation that has prevented the forming of a unified, forward-going foreign policy and the establishment of stability in international contact.

In addition, the disastrous state of her domestic economic affairs pushed Mao Tse-tung into a policy of war hysteria not against the United States in particular (U.S. policies having diligently avoided both offense and far-reaching contact) but against the Soviet Union. This maneuvering saved Mao Tse-tung from having to explain the failure of the "Great Leap Forward" and the "Cultural Revolution" to the masses. It was designed to make the continuous food shortages plausible to the people, if not the shortcomings of his regime. All hardships and deprivations were skillfully overshadowed by the news of impending war. And once more, the inadequacies of Communism had to be paid for by the sacrifice of the helpless masses while the promotion of warfare became Mao Tse-tung's cover for his ill-famed "thoughts."

AGGRESSION BY PROXY

The subversive and aggressive activities of Communist China

It is of foremost importance to recognize that it is not the United States who is "stubbornly keeping Communist China out of the United Nations" but that it is Peking who refuses to accept the stipulations laid down by the United Nations Charter by consistently flouting the "normal rules of conduct in the international community." Communist China has:

Twice carried on armed aggression against India;

Waged war against the United Nations in Korea;

Committed genocide in Tibet;

Created wide-scale disturbance in Macao and Hong Kong;

Nearly conquered Indonesia by a coup from within;

Furnishes massive material and personnel to North Vietnam;

Conducts wide-spread political, economic, and military subversion in Africa;

Gives all-out support to Castro's efforts to spread Maoist type guerrilla warfare in Latin America, including Puerto Rico—U.S. territory;

Gives ideological and financial support to many of the so-called student riots around the world—most openly in France and Italy.

"Communist China has encouraged disgraceful conduct by her diplomats abroad and has mistreated foreign diplomats and newsmen in mainland China, thus deliberately flaunting the rules of civilized international behavior.

"The prime official position of Communist China is open hostility toward the United States. Mao sees clearly that only the power and resolution of the United States stand between Communists and their avowed goal of world domination.

"So long as mainland China is controlled by Mao Tse-tung and his policies, there is no chance that any meaningful relationships can be established with the Chinese people. This has been proved time and again by the experience of France, Great Britain, India and other nations which have sought—by recognition, trade, and conciliatory gestures—to develop friendly, or at least civil, relations with the Peking regime."

With reference to Red China's revolutionary conduct in world affairs, Robert Hunter and Forrest Davis write in *The New Red China Lobby*, a study written in 1963 and revised in 1966:

"Besides helping Ho Chi Minh's cadres to terrorize the North Vietnamese population into submission, Communist China extended loans and outright grants amounting to \$670,000,000 to North Vietnam following the Geneva Conference in 1954. The bulk of this economic aid was to be used for the repair, expansion, and initial construction of 96 industrial enterprises. The Red Chinese constructed eleven highways and two railroad lines for the transport of supplies and arms from Communist China to North Vietnam for use in South Vietnam. In 1963, the Red Chinese supplied the North Vietnamese air force with 50 planes, including reconnaissance planes and jet fighters. At least 36 Mi5 and M17 fighters from the 9th Division of Red China's air force have been turned over to Hanoi.

"A group of North Vietnamese air cadets were trained in Nanning and returned to Hanoi in September 1964. Another group of 250 began training at Kunming and Mengtsu in April, 1965.

"Following the Tonkin Bay incident in August, 1964, the Chinese Communists supplied gunners, radar, and anti-aircraft guns to Hanoi. In February, 1965, a battalion of the 38th Infantry Division of Peiping's air

force was dispatched to North Vietnam to undertake air defense there. Twenty thousand uniformed members of Chinese Communist engineer battalions are working to rebuild strategic sites, roads, and communications lines destroyed by U.S. and South Vietnamese bombings. The Red Chinese have spared no cost in money, equipment, and lives in an effort to secure a springboard to Southeast Asia.

"Red China's military excursions are by no means the only tactics or the most dangerous deployed against the national integrity of Asian and African states. Vietnam is but one theater in the struggle between the free and non-aligned nations and Red China. Having paired off the United States against North Vietnam, Red China is in the highly advantageous position of having another country fight her wars, while China's commitment in the war with respect to arms, manpower, and political workers remains relatively small. Red China is thus free to devote much of her energy, funds, and cadres to the highly important task of subverting and propagandizing in every Asian, African, and Latin American country, plus the United States. Through these activities Peiping is laying the groundwork for future 'wars of national liberation,' in accordance with the strategy outlined by Lin Biao."

In a statement to the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 18, 1966, the representative of the Republic of China in the United Nations, Minister Wei Taoming, recalls "an editorial published in Peiping's official organ, *The People's Daily*, on 18 January 1966," in which "The Chinese Communists hailed the achievements of the 'First African-Asian-Latin-American People's Solidarity Conference' held in Havana":

The editorial believes that Peiping's "people's war" has gained the general acceptance of the revolutionary peoples of three continents.

The General Declaration issued by this Conference is indeed a document bearing all the earmarks of being made in Peiping. There is, for example, this key paragraph:

"We condemn the reactionary governments in their conspiracy against the people, as in the case of Nigeria. This is equally valid in some countries such as Senegal, Upper Volta, Cameroon, Niger, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Morocco, Libya and Tunisia, whose governments are the instruments of neo-colonialism."

This document goes on to say the members of the Conference are determined not only to support the liberation movement in countries under colonialism but also to support armed struggle in countries which, "although formally independent," have "long suffered exploitation and oppression of imperialism in many forms."

What are those countries that must be liberated in spite of their independence?

The list is a long one: according to its same document, Venezuela, Colombia, Brazil, Bolivia, Honduras, Guatemala, Peru, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Oman, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Senegal, Rwanda, Uganda, Nigeria, Cameroon, Dahomey, Madagascar and others.

A more brazen disregard of the right of other peoples to choose their own form of government or their way of life it would be difficult to imagine!

All these countries . . . are members of the United Nations. The General Assembly cannot look upon this call to arms, this incitement to violence against members of the United Nations, with indifference and unconcern.

Minister Wei then counteracts those who contend that the stress on guerrilla warfare is "a confession of weakness," by saying:

"The encouragement, training, financing and equipping of guerrillas in a whole series of countries could be more of a menace to

national independence and freedom than even the direct use of force by Peiping.

"In almost all of the newly independent countries there are dissident elements who, with aid and encouragement from abroad, are ready to play the role which the Vietcong are playing in the Republic of Vietnam. Aggression by proxy, as shown in Vietnam, can be more deadly than open and undisguised military invasion. In the latter it is easy to pinpoint the culprit and deal with him accordingly. But in the former the aggressor works behind the scenes and is thus enabled to emerge from his dark deeds with an air of self-righteousness and condemn those who come to the aid of the victim as trying to prevent the 'revolutionary people' from exercising their legitimate right of self-determination. Vietnam should be an object lesson to all.

There can be no question that the Chinese Communist regime of Peiping is the greatest threat to international peace and security, the greatest enemy to national independence and freedom. To vote for the seating of this regime would be to negate the basic principles and purposes of the Charter and to undercut whatever claim the United Nations may have to being a moral force in this trouble-ridden, crisis-ridden world."

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND NEUTRALITY

Communist Chinese do not abide by international law and reject the concept of neutrality

Peiping not only disavows recognition of international law but also shows disrespect for the integrity of individuals and other nations and, in addition, does not recognize political neutrality. Mao Tse-tung gave (in 1949) the following interpretation to neutrality, and developments during the recent past are proof that he still adheres to it:

Neutrality is camouflage, the third road does not exist.

Political neutrality in international law means nonalignment and should, in its pure interpretation and application, mean non-involvement in power blocs and power struggle. Such neutrality can easily lead a nation to isolation. At best, it is a difficult position for a nation to retain, especially for a weak nation. Confronted by Communist infiltration and aggression, such a nation will find that neutrality is no guarantee of safety, because neutrality is neither favored, respected, nor recognized by Communism.

Under Sihanouk's leadership, Cambodia claimed neutrality and was in the forefront among those promoting admission of non-aligned nations to the United Nations. Recent history can supply no more dramatic proof that neutrality cannot preserve a country's independence when it lies in the path of communist advancement and that a weak neutrality and accommodation is no insurance against Communist infiltration and interference. With his accommodating attitude towards Peking, the Prince delivered an object lesson to the world. It might also be interesting to note in this connection that Peking allowed Prince Sihanouk to establish a "government in exile," while insisting that the Republic of China cannot occupy a seat of the Chinese in exile because it does not represent the majority of the Chinese.

THE NUCLEAR ISSUE

Nuclear threat and blackmail cannot be regarded as reason for admission

Red China's propaganda is geared to create an atmosphere of tension and unrest, advocating an impending major confrontation short of a nuclear warfare threat. In spite of this, pro-admission spokesmen defend their position that Peking could and would be pacified by diplomatic concessions. They base their urgings for Red China's admission on the theory that an appeasing action by the

Western world would dwarf the belligerent tactics of those who hold the power and that such a move would pave the way for the thus created atmosphere of "peaceful coexistence."

After Communist China exploded the third nuclear device of an estimated 130 kilotons on May 9, 1966, these same lobbyists asked for a "more realistic" United States policy, claiming that our criticism of Red China was too harsh. Their voices could not challenge the fact that Peking still maintains an uncivilized and unpeaceful position. The tragedies of Korea, Tibet, and Indonesia still speak too loudly for themselves. The respective leaders of Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, Burma, and India will readily vouch for the presently existing subversive and/or aggressive intentions of Red China. In Africa, the governments of Burundi, Niger, the Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Upper Volta, Malawi, the Central African Republic, Kenya, Ghana, the Congo all have, to varying degrees, had—and still have—experience with Communist China's subversive ambitions. Some have broken off diplomatic relations with Peking in protest to these interventions; others feel that this would only drive Red China's activists underground and make advancements more difficult to detect. All these countries, and many more on other continents as well, can prove that Mao Tse-tung's revolutionary pronouncements are not just threatening rhetoric but that he means what he says and that world conquest is foremost on his agenda. But as far as American apologists were concerned, the explosion of Red China's nuclear device was to be reason enough for the United States to mellow. In other words, nobody proved that Red China was changing into a nation eligible to be included in the world of nations. She was in the process of becoming a nuclear power, she had developed a threatening device, and therefore, she should now be admitted to the United Nations.

If the threat of nuclear arms is the basis for admission, then the primary condition for membership would mean that the capability to incite fear constitutes eligibility for membership. This is not so. While Red China's nuclear capacity may well be used by her to blackmail Asia and other parts of the world, it cannot be regarded as an admission ticket to the United Nations. Aggression and the threat of aggression are not listed in the United Nations Charter as a basis for eligibility for admission. What would a compromise position accomplish? It would not only expose our allies and other nations to Red China's militant outreach but would strengthen Peking in the belief that in following the policies of the past, victory would be theirs. Such a position would only further Peking's power thrust, not curb it.

Mao Tse-tung's pronouncements on nuclear war are well known and should be recalled in this connection:

"In a nuclear war, mainland China may have to sacrifice 300 million people, and yet more than 320 million people would survive—she would still remain a great nation."

Though one half of the human beings would be sacrificed in a nuclear war, yet the remaining half still could build up Communism."

The United States bears the primary responsibility for preventing the Chinese Communists from embroiling the world in a revolutionary war, and in a nuclear war. Such is our role as a world power. The U.N. has not fulfilled its role in this respect. Appeasement, however, would only whet the appetite of the Chinese aggressor. We have to show that nuclear blackmail will not deter us and weaken us. America's determination in Southeast Asia to check communist advancement, our will to fight in Vietnam, our intervention in Cambodia have shown Red China our determination to stop communist aggression.

The disadvantage to the Western world of a further increase of communist power within the world community and in the United Nations should be clear. The question then would be whether admission bears any advantages with respect to the feared extreme condition of confrontation, the use of nuclear arms, or to the prerequisite of stockpiling additional nuclear defensive weapons and the building of defensive systems. The relevant example would be the United States relationship to Soviet Russia which shows whether detente, or the offer of friendship towards a communist nation results in a guarantee for peace. With the USSR we have "peacefully coexisted" since the Geneva Conference. The Soviet Union is a co-member of the United Nations. This then should have removed the threat of nuclear war between us. Treaties concluded and negotiations in progress should furthermore have cemented this relationship to a point where neither threat of nuclear war nor adversary exists—and the arms race should presumably have halted. It should, if the reasonings of pro-admission voices are applied, have long since developed into a relationship of total trustfulness and friendship. In reality, however, the United States and the Soviet Union confront each other continuously in policymaking decisions in the United Nations as well as on all political and ideological fronts. Dealing with an even more unscrupulous regime, we could, after admission of Communist China to the United Nations, neither afford to let down our guards nor foreclose defensive options in the nuclear missile race. On the contrary, the threat to our security would grow in the same measure as Red China's leaders gain stature and with the increased confidence that their immortality has been sanctioned. After being granted recognition, they would also be placed in a position where they can function more freely and destructively on the world scene.

Strength and unity here at home, not the image of the "paper tiger," will be the only valid deterrent.

ARGUMENTS

Of pro-admission lobbyists

Aside from such general statements as, "we need a fresh look; we need a fresh approach," and the aforementioned "universality" theory, the representation issue and claim of eligibility through prevalence, it is the "let our policies toward them be separate but equal" contention—meaning that just as the Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations, the Communist Chinese have that right as well—that prompts pro-admission spokesmen to argue for Communist China's recognition.

Theodore Sorensen, during a conference on United States-China relations on March 21, 1969, worded his argument in favor of this theory thus:

"[Some may reply that] China is more hostile and Russia more friendly. It is true that Peking's words have been more hostile than Moscow's, and any overture we make now may well be rejected. But Moscow's deeds have been more threatening than Peking's; and surely our policy in terms of what we seek should not place more importance on words than on deeds. For it is the Soviets, not the Chinese, who are the chief suppliers of weapons used against our troops by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. It is the Soviet Union, not China, whose forces pose as a potential threat to our own at the Berlin Wall and in the Mediterranean. It was the Soviets who tried to establish nuclear missile bases in the Western Hemisphere, and who ruthlessly invaded their peaceful neighbor for merely aspiring toward a greater degree of independence."

"There have been in recent years no comparable deployments of Chinese forces outside their own borders, not even any very serious threats against those American forces sta-

tioned on territory claimed by the Red Chinese. Nor is there any longer good reason to believe that the North Koreans, North Vietnamese and other Asian Communists now giving us trouble on that continent are wholly owned and operated subsidiaries of the government of Mao Tse-tung. Propaganda from Peking may be far more harsh and belligerent than the anti-American propaganda emanating from Moscow; but China in fact cannot now match the Soviet Union's economic, industrial or military capability to sustain a major threat to this country's very existence, and that difference in capability surely speaks louder than any difference in propaganda."

Basing his point of view in favor of admission on the conception that "there is no foundation . . . for our continuing to apply a double standard to our relations with the Soviets and the Chinese," Mr. Sorensen seems to overlook the fact that two negatives do not add up to one plus. The difference as far as the undesirable reality is concerned is that the Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations but this, again, should not be sufficient reason for knowingly to extend the communist power bloc. While it is interesting to note that Mr. Sorensen realizes that the Soviet Union has in her "deeds" continuously threatened world peace, he seems to be almost apologetic over the fact that the Red Chinese have not supplied North Vietnam with as many weapons as has the Soviet Union. He seems to suggest that we should measure our degree of friendliness to other communist nations by the amount of damage they are able to do to us and the rest of the world. The difference between economic and military strength and the disparity in strength of leadership between the Soviet Union and Communist China should be an ample explanation for the amount of weapons supplied to other militant nations.

As to Sorensen's dubiously relevant statement that "there have been in recent years no comparable deployments of Chinese forces outside their own borders," a more thorough study of Chinese communist subversive activities might be recommended. Mr. Sorensen, and others, might quickly come to the conclusion that Peking's activities are not just words and propaganda, and by a more thorough study of communist techniques he might also learn that it is pure Marxism-Leninism to let others do the actual fighting, if this can be arranged, and to "be merely" an aggressor by proxy.

At the same conference, one-time United States Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur Goldberg consents:

"My own view is that virtually nothing that the United States can do in the foreseeable future with respect to Mainland China will change the present unsatisfactory state of relationships between these two countries. Even if we were to whole-hog disavow Taiwan and establish diplomatic relations with Mainland China, I doubt that anything much or different or for the better would happen in U.S.-China relations in the near future. The extremely xenophobic character of the present Chinese regime would seem to me to preclude a genuine betterment of relationships."

Nevertheless, Arthur Goldberg comes, as he himself admits, "paradoxically" to the conclusion that he will stand for a change in our China policy.

One of the most surprising statements in relation to our policy on Red China comes from Senator Jacob Javits, made at the Conference on United States-China Relations: "If a relaxation of our own zealous ideological opposition to China leads to a similar lessening of the anti-communist ardor of some of our close allies in Asia—such as the Philippines and Thailand—we must take

this calmly. For, the lesson of the past twenty years has been that nationalism, and nationalism alone, is an effective barrier against the extension of Chinese-style communism in Asia. This requires a shift of emphasis in our education and information efforts in Asia. The virtues of viable and progressive national integrity, rather than the dangers and evils of Chinese communism, should be the focus of our efforts."¹¹

Further, Javits, in his suggestions to make "both admission to the United Nations and diplomatic recognition easy and natural" says:

"The Nixon Administration has a great opportunity to bury the lingering pall of McCarthyism which continues subtly to inhibit thought and debate in this country concerning China. The United States paid a very heavy price during the McCarthy period in the destruction of many of our most perceptive China experts. It was not only a period of grave human injustice to individuals but also a period of grave damage to our national stock of intellectual resources and experience which has seriously affected the clarity and accuracy of our perception of events in Asia."¹²

Not further substantiating this statement, Mr. Javits failed to explain why he gropes back to this era and does not mention why he, himself, changed his mind between 1966 and 1969. As a member of the 89th Congress, Senator Jacob Javits of New York endorsed the following declaration as of January, 1966:

"A declaration in opposition to any concessions to Communist China:

"We are opposed to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

"We are opposed to granting United States diplomatic recognition to the Peking regime.

"We are opposed to trade relations between the United States and Communist China.

"We are opposed to any policy of accommodation which might be interpreted as U.S. acquiescence in, or approval of, Communist China's aggression, direct or indirect, against her neighbors.

"In endorsing the above, we earnestly believe we are acting in our national interest and the interest of freedom throughout the world and that this statement represents the thinking of the great majority of the American people."¹³

The great majority of the American people would still subscribe to this declaration; the question is only, "What has happened to Mr. Javits's thinking?" Could it be that "his perception of events" has been influenced and that he suffered in his "clarity" when he suggested that some of our close allies in Asia lessen their anticommunist ardor? Or did he perhaps see a political advantage for himself by changing his views? Mao Tse-tung has not changed.

POLICY OF NO REWARD

U.S. policy pronouncements on the question of Red China

In January of 1970, talks between Communist China and the United States were resumed in Warsaw. No major developments have arisen from these ambassadorial exchanges. The most comprehensive pronouncements of our present government officials on positions in regard to Red China are given in "Nixon on the Issues," assembled by the Nixon-Agnew Committee during the presidential campaign of 1968. Following are the relevant statements:

On Communist China

Any American policy toward Asia must come urgently to grips with the reality of China. This does not mean, as many would simplistically have it rushing to grant recognition to Peking, to admit it to the United Nations and to ply it with offers of trade—all of which would serve to confirm its rulers

in their present course. It does mean recognizing the present and potential danger from Communist China, and taking measures designed to meet that danger. It also means distinguishing carefully between long-range and short-range policies, and fashioning short-range programs so as to advance our long-range goals.

Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its neighbors. There is no place in this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation. But we could go disastrously wrong if, in pursuing this long-range goal, we failed in the short run to read the lessons of history.

The world cannot be safe until China changes. Thus our aim, to the extent that we can influence events, should be to induce change. The way to do this is to persuade China that it "must" change: that it cannot satisfy its imperial ambitions, and that its own national interest requires a turning away from foreign adventuring and turning inward toward the solution of its own domestic problems.

Only as the nations of non-communist Asia become so strong—economically, politically and militarily—that they no longer furnish tempting targets for Chinese aggression, will the leaders in Peking be persuaded to turn their energies inward rather than outward. And that will be the time when the dialogue with mainland China will begin. For the short run, then, this means a policy of firm restraint, of no reward, of a creative counter-pressure designed to persuade Peking that its interests can be served only by accepting the basic rules of international civility. For the long run, it means pulling China back into the world community—but as a great and progressing nation, not as the epicenter of world revolution.

The dialogue with China must come, I think, during the two terms of the next president. I do not believe we should recognize Communist China now or admit it to the United Nations, because that would be in effect putting the seal of approval on Communist China's present very aggressive course against India and against our forces of course in Vietnam and against all of its neighbors.¹⁴

On U.N. Membership

I do not favor granting a seat in the United Nations to the Communist Chinese at this time. I do not rule it out for a future time, provided they meet certain conditions.

Why do we resist Chinese coming into the United Nations? It's because they at the present time are engaged in a course of aggression against members of the United Nations and do not qualify as a peace-loving nation, in effect, as the United Nations Charter does require.

I think that until the Chinese Communists indicate they are willing to become civilized members of the community of nations, they should not be given the prestige of being in the United Nations. And I do not believe, incidentally, that there is any excuse to say that we can't communicate with them without their being in the United Nations because we can and we do.

A strong Japan and a strong group of free nations around the perimeter of China will have more effect on mellowing the Chinese Communist leaders than anything else we could do. Because once the Chinese Communist leaders realize that there is a risk in trying to break out, then the Chinese leaders will have to turn inward and solve some of their own problems.

I think that the Chinese Communist leaders will change their policies when they realize that by not being belligerent toward the United States and toward their neighbors in Asia, including the Indians and all the rest,

that by turning inward and trying to work for their own people, that they have a much greater possibility to have a better life for their own people.

The answer is that trade with China, recognition of China, admitting it to the UN, should come only when the Chinese Communists indicate by deeds that they want to be a part of the civilized family of nations and not an outlaw nation.

On Recognition

I would not recognize Red China now and I would not agree to admitting it to the UN and I wouldn't go along with those well-intentioned people that said, "Trade with them," because that may change them.

Because doing it now would only encourage them, the hardliners in Peking and hardline policy that they're following. And it would have an immense effect in discouraging great numbers of non-communist elements in Free Asia that are now just beginning to develop their strength and their own confidence.¹⁵

On Expansionist Policy

We have to realize, looking down the road, that Communist China within six years, seven years, at the very least, will have a significant nuclear capability. And Communist China will be outside of the nuclear club. Therefore, whoever is elected president this next time has to be thinking now as to how we develop the power around the perimeter of China which will convince the Communist Chinese leaders that they will not gain—as a matter of fact, that they will run very great risks—in the event that they attempt to expand through the area of the Pacific as they have been attempting to expand in their sorties against India and other countries who are their neighbors.¹⁶

On Evolution [As a Necessity]

Red China will change as they are convinced by what happens in the settlement of Vietnam. They will be convinced, as they see the strength of Japan and the other free countries on the perimeter of China growing economically and eventually, probably militarily. They will then become convinced that their best interests will be served by turning inward rather than outward. Then the dialogue will begin. Then Red China, as it changes and becomes a civilized member of the community of nations, will be recognized and will be admitted to the United Nations.¹⁷

CONCLUSION

The decision for or against the seating of Red China in the United Nations, in the final analysis, will be the answer to the question whether or not we ourselves believe strongly in the principles by which our own nation is guided. Do we identify ourselves with the 95 percent of the Chinese oppressed by a system that in every respect is contrary to these principles, or do we wish to support the 5 percent who are the oppressors and thereby abandon our own standard in favor of theirs? By sanctioning totalitarianism we are sanctioning oppression. It is our respect for the Chinese people and the realization that the Peking regime is against the will of the people that binds the United States to the stand of non-recognition in the hope that justice will eventually be victorious.

Just as we cannot write off Asia as a lost cause and grant Communism the right to proceed in their world conquest unchallenged, so can we not allow Communist China to gain a victory of decisive proportion by granting Peking the prestige of joining a world body that is supposed to be dedicated to the preservation and restoration of peace and justice. To do so would be tantamount to giving them the green light to lead that organization that is the hope and promise of 125 nations to ineffectiveness. Without our firmness in the past, communist conquest, for instance in South America, as well as in Asia, would be even more advanced than it is

Footnotes at end of article.

today. Communism would also become irresistible to many smaller nations that do not possess the power and strength to resist it unaided both ideologically and militarily. If we show weakness in the question of admission and recognition, we give the world one more sign that we ourselves are weakening and have given up resistance. We would, in disregard of our own national interest, give power and prestige to a hostile nation and would deny an oppressed people hope for the future.

How do we expect to contain the advancement of Communism in Southeast Asia if we help to increase Peking's power and influence? We are bound through treaties, and our foreign policy is based on the support and assistance of non-communist countries in Southeast Asia and elsewhere with the intention and obligation to help these states preserve their independence. With our own manpower we fight and pay for our ideals and convictions. Since the beginning of the Korean War, our foreign policy has been guided to prevent any further increase in communist influence. We have paid heavily for it. And yet, were we to recognize Red China, we would with the stroke of a pen undo what we have accomplished while actively fighting for our convictions and for the freedom of others, and we would unleash the forces we are opposing on the battlefield. We would, with the word "yes," tell our allies that we have given up the struggle for freedom for others—and for ourselves. We would give them the green light for expansion of their system.

Our present policy and our treaties in the Far East have saved Taiwan from communist direct aggression, have let Japan develop in peace and security, have given South Korea the chance to experience freedom and self-determination and achieve one of the world's leading economic growth rates. In spite of the communist-incited war actions in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, we have, through our presence, given other countries in Southeast Asia the hope and assurance that they will not be overrun by Communism unchallenged and have extended the time-span wherein they can strengthen their own defense.

There is one simple question for those who doubt that our attitude of the past and our present policy towards Peking are logical and right. Would we wish ourselves to be governed by men like Mao Tse-tung, Lin Biao, Chou En-lai, and the like? Would we give them our vote of confidence? No, we would not. The Chinese people would not and did not. Why then should we vote for them and recognize the rulers they reject? Why would we subject others to what we do not accept for ourselves? Out of 21,000 Korean POWs, 14,000 voted not to return to their communist-ruled homeland, in spite of pressures and threats against them and their families from Peking!

Foremost, however, the effectiveness of the work of the United Nations, already heavily impaired by the communist bloc vetoes, would suffer additional impairment and it would sooner or later meet a fate similar to that of the League of Nations.

But above all, such a decisive step should take into consideration that the Communist Chinese have not adapted their foreign policy to the basic principles of international law and order and that it is, therefore, not in our national interest to grant them recognition. Nations outside the communist power bloc who have chosen the road of accommodation cannot register any advantage or safety from subversive infiltration, nor have their relationships with Red China measurably improved. The best example, however, that the ties of friendship and even unity in ideology do not minimize war-like threats lies within the communist bloc; namely, the strained Moscow-Peking position of tension.

While the two countries compete in their interpretation and representation of pure Marxism-Leninism, they aggravate their relationship with offensive verbal insults, formerly reserved for the United States, and seem unable to solve their border differences. They jealously disagree over their respective areas of influence and their roles in communist advancement efforts and world conquest to which both nations are equally dedicated. Friendship treaties, even between communist nations have, furthermore, as little meaning between communist nations as they have between communist countries and the Free World. If the Communist Chinese believe it to be in their interest not to abide by the principles of the United Nations Charter in their international conduct, they would, logically, not adhere to these principles when occupying a seat in the United Nations and are thereby made a judge over the conduct of other nations. It can hardly be expected that Red China would be in a position to act as an advising contributor to the solution of world problems when it cannot solve its own to any extent.

It is, in fact, the failure of the United Nations to fulfill its objective as a peace-keeping body and its incapability of enforcing international law that makes it necessary for the United States to retain and rely on its own strength in order to preserve its superiority and to be the guardian for many weaker nations. This role of protector against communist interference in the sovereignty of states should actually be the task of the United Nations.

The potential for the reduction and removal of nuclear threat and fear of nuclear war does not derive from a signed treaty document, an agreement that can be willfully broken by a signator—or by a nation not included in the agreement—but lies in the removal of the cause for fear itself. As long as countries like Czechoslovakia can be overrun at the first display of an awakening independence, as long as a country like Thailand must fearfully guard its borders, as long as the North Vietnamese are encouraged by Peking and Moscow-provided weapons to invade neighboring territories, as long as India must live in anticipation of a new outbreak of war on her borders with Red China, as long as the people of East Germany and East Berlin are separated from freedom by a stone wall and barbed wire, and as long as all governments of the Free World are faced with the manifold manipulations of communist infiltration and subversion, the threat of war or of defensive warlike actions, inclusive of nuclear war, will remain a dominant threat and fear. Moscow and Peking-directed Communism is the disturber of peace. The ineffectiveness of the United Nations results, in great measure, from Moscow's ability to veto any resolution that condemns communist aggression. It is the membership and vote of nations whose governments are not guided by the peace-loving policy which the United Nations Charter prescribes that undermine its ideals.

Self-determination, human rights, freedom, liberty, and peace remain empty words if they cannot be shared with all mankind. The voices in the United States speaking for accommodation do, seemingly, not cherish what they possess. The meaning of these words is the same for all peoples and in all languages. Where men are deprived of self-determination and human rights through the rule of a totalitarian system, they suffer equally in any land. It is the extension of hope that they will regain their freedom, not the condemnation to prolonged subjugation that they deserve.

In these precarious times when the Free World confronts the advancing forces of Communism on many fronts and in many forms, we cannot afford an experiment that under every possible aspect is doomed to fail-

ure, by rewarding an aggressor with recognition. It is absolutely essential that Red China's acceptance of the standards of international conduct be adequately proven before the United Nations considers the seating of that nation. But even then, if this should mean the ouster of the Republic of China, a nation that has in its international behavior never shown default, the issue is not debatable.

EPILOGUE

We cannot believe that true Americans who love their country and value their priceless heritage of freedom under God would purposely commit national suicide by closing their eyes to the realities of communist goals.

In the realization, however, that "none are so blind as they who will not see," we continue to seek every opportunity to bring these facts before the American people. Your assistance in the form of a contribution and/or in the wider distribution of this booklet would be most welcome.

FOOTNOTES

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. 9, Oct. 2, 1920, pp. 474-78.

² Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Address, Nov. 3, 1969, U.N. advance copy, translation GX XXIV/PR-3.

³ Dr. Stephen Pan and Father Raymond de Jaeger, *Peking's Red Guard*, Twin Circle Publishing Co., New York, pp. 169, 170.

⁴ Prof. Franz Michael, "China and World Security," Address, March 10, 1969, press release, pp. 4, 5.

⁵ Dr. Walter Judd, Statement to the Committee on Resolutions of the Republican National Convention, release by the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations, July 29, 1969.

⁶ Robert Hunter and Forrest Davis, *The New Red China Lobby*, Constructive Action, Inc., Whittier, Calif., rev. ed., 1966, pp. 31, 32.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 187, 188.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 188, 189.

⁹ Theodore Sorensen, Address, Conference on United States-China Relations, March 21, 1969, press release.

¹⁰ Arthur Goldberg, "The U.S. and China—Policy Alternatives for the Future," Address, Conference on U.S.-China Relations, March 21, 1969, press release, pp. 1, 2.

¹¹ Jacob Javits, Address, Conference on U.S.-China Relations, March 21, 1969, press release.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *The New Red China Lobby*, op. cit., pp. 169, 170.

¹⁴ "Nixon on the Issues," Nixon-Agnew Campaign Committee, New York, 1968, p. 57.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 59.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Clergymen's Committee on China, Inc.

Following the establishment of the Clergymen's Committee on China in the Summer of 1966 by the late Dr. Daniel A. Poling, correspondence with many hundreds of clergymen and laymen revealed their desire for a continuing educational program providing factual information and material on Red China. Many clergymen who stand in opposition to Communism and are opposed to appeasement of this evil system wanted representation by a permanent organization.

Therefore, the Clergymen's Committee on China was incorporated and adopted the following aims and purposes for its future work:

1. To establish an educational program for the clergy and other interested Americans on China;
2. To dispel erroneous public opinions on the stand of the clergy concerning the admission of China to the United Nations;

3. To articulate the relationship between the historical and ongoing missionary concern of the Church and the vast problems it is experiencing in the Far East . . . as in many other troubled areas of the world . . . because of the militant, atheistic nature of Communism;

4. To set forth in clear perspective the fact that our present involvement in Vietnam is directly related to the overall China question, Communist aggression, Christian mission, and world peace.

LET US PROTECT OUR FLAG

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, over a month ago I rose to protest the degradation of our national emblem by extremists on both the left and the right and by certain manufacturers and boutiques that have capitalized on dissenters' desires to lower the flag to new depths of commercialism. I then introduced H.R. 18671 to increase the penalties for flag desecration and to expand the definition of desecration to include not only wanton acts to destroy or mutilate the flag but also acts of disrespect already defined by the Federal flag code.

Today, I am introducing legislation to authorize a constitutional amendment to clearly specify Congress' power to enact laws to protect the flag from desecration and to regulate display and handling of the flag. If enacted, the amendment would also prevent the flag salute from going the way of prayers in public buildings or public schools. I am introducing this amendment not because I feel that Congress now lacks this power and not because I have any doubt that anyone can now voluntarily salute the flag in a public building, but to prevent the Supreme Court from changing the existing law in this field and to end current misunderstandings over what can be done to protect the flag.

This amendment is necessary because the Supreme Court has refused to face up to the challenge presented by the flag burners and desecrators and tell them they can be punished for their criminal actions. In two cases which sought to determine whether burning or mutilation of the flag is a form of symbolic speech protected from Federal punishment by the first amendment and by State law through the first and 14th amendments, the Supreme Court has ducked the question. The Court first was asked to consider whether a State could punish for the burning of the flag in *Street v. New York*, 394 U.S. 576 (1969). In that case, the appellant, apparently distraught over the shooting of civil rights leader James Meredith, took an American flag to a street corner near his home in New York City and burned it. While burning the flag, Street told a small crowd that had gathered:

We don't need no damn flag.

He said to the officer who arrested him:

If they let that happen to Meredith, we don't need no flag.

The Supreme Court found that because words were spoken while the flag was burned, the State might have been punishing Street's words as well as his acts which would violate his first amendment, freedom of speech. The Court refused to rule on the main question—whether flag burning itself could be punished—and remanded the case for a determination of whether the punishment had been for more than the actual desecration. Four of the nine Justices recognized that the Court was engaged in a side-stepping operation and dissented from the decision. Chief Justice Warren warned that the decision was as bad as no decision at all because it "encourages others to test in the streets the powers of our States and National Government to impose criminal sanctions upon those who would desecrate the flag." 394 U.S. at 605.

The Supreme Court was asked last year to consider whether the cutting or sewing of a flag in a vest which was worn on a public street in Los Angeles was a protected form of expression or could be, as the Los Angeles Appellate Division of the California Superior Court has found, a violation of that State's desecration law. The Court dismissed the case on January 19, 1970, because it was not "suitable for considering this broad question." In his concurring opinion Justice Harlan stated that the question of what constitutes "symbolic speech" was significant but that there was an inadequate record for deciding the question presented since it had not been presented at his trial or original appeal in California. The Justice ominously warned that:

The Court has, as yet, not established a test for determining at what point conduct becomes so intertwined with expression that it becomes necessary to weigh the State's interest in proscribing conduct against the constitutionality protected interest in freedom of expression. *Cowgill v. California*, 396 U.S. 371, 372.

The Court in United States against O'Brien, the draft-card burning case, had previously found the burning of selective service registration cards to be a form of symbolic speech which could be punished only because the act barring such conduct furthered a sufficiently important governmental interest unrelated to suppression of speech—to raise and support armies—that the incidental restrictions on first amendment freedoms were no greater than essential. Is the protection of our national emblem also a sufficiently important interest? I would think so and the 1907 Supreme Court flag desecration case, *Halter against Nebraska*, would appear to support my contention. But the Supreme Court seems to be reluctant to speak to this issue.

Another desecration case involving the use of the flag in obscene sculptures, allegedly to emphasize dissent from national policies, *Street against New York*, was docketed on May 18, 1970, with no decision yet made to review this conviction that has been affirmed by the highest appellate court in New York State.

This may be the opportunity for a decision on this issue of how far we can go to protect the flag from those who would use it as a vehicle for their dissatisfaction with our society.

I hope that the Court's failure to determine the constitutionality of recent antidesecration laws results only from a reluctance to deal with the desecrators until a clear fact situation reaches the Bench and is not a delaying tactic by some Justices to gather votes to overturn precedent and permit the flag to be misused for narrow political interests. This amendment would ease the Court's obvious dilemma and the concerns we all feel when we see the flag abused and wonder if something can be done to prevent it. This amendment would clear the path for Congress to enact meaningful legislation to provide uniform standards and methods for display and use of the flag with sanctions to deter those who would use the flag as a pawn to promote their narrow interests. We need to restore the flag to its position as the symbol of our Nation's highest goals and ideals, of the common purposes that unite us, rather than as a banner of division—the emblem of all—the people of the United States of America. To this end, I insert the full text of my proposed constitutional amendment in the RECORD at this point:

H.J. Res. 1377

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building, school, or educational institution which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate voluntarily in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States.

"Section 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, the Congress shall have power by appropriate legislation to regulate the display and handling of the flag of the United States and to protect it from desecration.

"Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on this 183d anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, I believe it is appropriate to recall some of the words on the great document.

The preamble to the Constitution reads as follows:

We, the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The Constitution and the first 10 amendments to it, called the Bill of Rights, got America off on the right foot. This document has worked so well that despite the monumental changes in American society over a period of 183 years, we have been compelled to make only 15 changes.

To those who are so dissatisfied with America today, I would challenge them to find a better document or a better form of government. For despite America's shortcomings, her people are still enjoying the most personal freedom, the highest standard of living, and the greatest hope for the future of any people who ever lived.

For this we can thank the foresight and wisdom of those who drafted and signed this great Constitution 183 years ago this week.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days, the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography will submit its report to the President and to the Congress.

If what the media have reported recently in detail is indicative of what the majority report will contain, we will be faced with the task of repudiating a monumental fiasco which we created October 3, 1967, and financed to the tune of \$2 million.

Unfortunately, this will not be the first time that funds, soundly appropriated with the best intentions, have come back to haunt us.

However, it may be the first time that we will be compelled to spend additional sums to undo the work of a Presidential Commission which seems to have ignored its prime mandate.

IGNORES CONGRESS MANDATE

The Commission was instructed by law, among other things, to recommend legislation or other action "necessary to regulate effectively the flow of such traffic"—in obscenity and pornography—but the Commission chooses instead to recommend abolition of present laws in this area.

Such a recommendation is diametrically opposed to the purpose for which the Commission was created. Congress had determined that the "traffic in obscenity and pornography is a matter of national concern"—Public Law 90-100.

What we were looking for were ways and means to curb the dissemination of smut.

But what is being recommended? A course of action which would serve exactly the opposite end.

One would think that the Commission's recommendations in this regard were the product of the directors of the American Civil Liberties Union. The ACLU position is a matter of record. It is vigorously opposed to any censorship of obscenity.

FOLLOW VIEWS OF ACLU

Further, and contrary to holdings of the Supreme Court—Roth-Alberts rulings, 1957—the ACLU believes that obscenity is entitled to constitutional protection as much as any other form of speech or the press.

Such preconceived beliefs obviously were the guidelines thrust upon the Commission. The Chairman of the Commission, William B. Lockhart, has long been a member of the American Civil Liberties Union. His personally appointed general counsel, Paul Bender, is an executive of the Philadelphia branch of the ACLU.

It is also interesting to note that Mr. Lockhart, as early as 1954 and as recently as 1960, authored law review articles with his colleague, Robert C. McClure, concerning censorship of obscenity.

The conclusions Mr. Lockhart drew in these articles not unexpectedly follow the line of the forthcoming Commission report.

SIMPLE REPORT WOULD BE CHEAPER

Indeed, in this light and in retrospect, perhaps it would have been more practical simply to have hired Mr. Lockhart to write a report on the subject instead of creating a Commission with preconceived conclusions. At least we should have saved most of the \$2 million.

In organizing for its work, Chairman Lockhart and the Commission adopted a strict secrecy pact at its very first meeting, thereby denying the Congress and the public any knowledge of the guidelines established and the progress of the study.

The first substantial information became available only when a copy was obtained by the Chicago Tribune last month.

REPORTED MAJORITY VIEWS

The conclusions drawn by the Commission were shocking to say the least. The major findings, as reported by the Tribune, are:

1. Obscene materials, printed and photographic, have no harmful effects upon old or young.
2. Repeated exposure to "erotic stimuli" eventually creates boredom.
3. After exposure to obscenity, persons are generally less fearful of harmful effects.
4. Exposure to pornographic materials has no detrimental impact upon moral character, sexual orientation or attitudes about sexuality among youth. It has no connection with juvenile delinquency.
5. Sex offenders are less interested in erotic material than other adults. There is no evidence that exposure to it operates as a cause of misconduct in either youth or adults.

"Collectively, these studies suggest that the

topic of erotica is generally defined and discussed in ways very different from that commonly supposed by articulate critics," the report states.

"Most Americans, both laymen and professionals, do not regard erotica as a matter of prime national concern, nor is there a consensus that its use is potentially harmful for the consumer or for society."

Such conclusions and the whole approach taken by the majority to the smut problem are reprehensible. The end result of what is being recommended is that we follow Denmark's lead in abolishing all controls over obscenity.

One apparent justification for this course is the claim that sex-crimes have decreased in Denmark since it repealed its obscenity statutes. Except that the claim is false. Indeed, nothing could be further from the truth.

First, it is too early to substantiate such claims or to formulate any such conclusions, since the "experiment—and that is all it really is—was begun only last year, 1969.

Second, the statistics which have been cited are grossly distorted.

DENMARK DATA IN QUESTION

Serious sex crimes such as rape and sexual assault remained at the 1968 level in Denmark, despite reports that sex crimes had fallen off in 1969 due to the legalization of pornography.

In a UPI report from Copenhagen, dated January 10, criminologists cautioned against crediting a drop in sex crimes to the new laws. Previous reports had said that sex crimes had dropped 31 percent.

The latest UPI story said that, according to police officials and criminologists, the 31-percent figure was misleading because it included public indecency, voyeurism, male prostitution and the sale of pornographic material, which is no longer considered a crime. Rape and sexual assault have not dropped.

Karl O. Christiansen, head of Copenhagen's Criminological Institution, said legalized pornography had changed Danish attitudes toward sex. He said:

We have stopped calling police every time a man is seen in a dark alley with a woman or a child.

MUST REPUDIATE MINORITY VIEW

The sad conclusion one must draw from the activities of the President's Commission, its findings and recommendations, is that it wishes the profit-hungry smut peddler to be its sole beneficiary while subjecting the great majority of the American public to an unending parade of filth, which it does not want.

I, for one, will have no part of it and I am sure that the Congress, to a man, fully concurs with me and will join me in doing everything within our power to repudiate this horrendous report.

There is one bright hope, however, to which we can look forward: the views of the minority on the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, included the Reverend Morton A. Hill, S.J., Winfrey C. Link, and Charles H. Keating, Jr.

Unfortunately, these views are not those of the majority, although certainly they should be.

SQUEEZE ON MONEY IS EASING

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, last week, my colleague, WILLIAM WIDNALL, stressed the significance of the lowering of the prime interest rate by the First Pennsylvania Bank and Trust Co. as a sign that the economy was improving—despite the big-spending, low-taxes deficit caused by the democratically controlled Congress.

Today, I would like to draw to the attention of the House a short article appearing in the U.S. News & World Report. According to their economic unit, the money squeeze is easing—they point to half a dozen specific items to make their case.

I am sure that businessmen and consumers across the country are heartened to see these signs that the economy is turning around in response to the administration's measures to bring inflation under control. It is too bad that this viewpoint is not shared by the democratic majority in both Houses who through their control of Congress also control the fiscal balance which, in turn, has a major impact on inflation.

Despite the tremendous progress made by the administration in halting inflation and avoiding a recession, without the full cooperation of Congress in curbing the growing fiscal deficit these efforts will come to naught. I therefore urge the Democrats, even though elections are not far off, to put aside the political considerations which have led them to support inflationary measures and join with Republicans in Congress in trying to put the economy back on a steady course.

I include the U.S. News & World Report article of September 14, 1970, in the RECORD:

STUDY SHOWS SQUEEZE ON MONEY IS EASING

The squeeze on money that has plagued corporations and consumers for months is clearly easing. That is the finding of a study by the Economic Unit of "U.S. News & World Report."

Credit is more readily available, and interest rates are declining. Result in weeks ahead will be an increase in credit for home mortgages, more cash for financially pressed businesses, and a boost for the economy generally.

Bearing out the study's findings was a prediction by Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans that interest rates will go down further. Mr. Stans said on September 3, "I think we will see 6 per cent interest rates again, and perhaps not too far off."

The study pinpoints a series of business-stimulated actions by the Federal Reserve Board since the first of the year, when interest rates were setting records.

In January, banks' lendable funds were increased by open-market buying of Government securities.

In May, margins for stock purchases were cut from 80 percent to 65.

In June, interest-rate ceilings on large time deposits maturing in 30 to 89 days were eliminated.

In August, reserve requirements on large time deposits were cut to 5 per cent from 6 per cent, thus boosting banks' lending power.

An important effect of these and other moves has been a decline in interest rates.

From the peaks prevailing at the turn of the year—

Treasury bills are down from 8.1 per cent to 6.3 per cent.

Commercial paper has declined from 9 per cent to 7.7 per cent.

Bond yields, on average, have dropped one-half to 1 point.

VIETNAM POLICY SURVEY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following survey of our Vietnam policy:

SURVEY OF OUR VIETNAM POLICY

The question which must weigh most heavily upon President Nixon as he carries forward with his "irreversible" policy of troop withdrawal is whether the American people will back his policy if the going gets rough. He will find cause for reassurance, I feel, in the response to the first question on my annual survey of constituents.

As I interpret the response, my constituents want no turning back. Even if South Vietnam proves unable to defend itself, this should not deter the President from continuing with the withdrawal of our troops. I think this resolve is especially important because I fear some hard knocks are ahead for both the South Vietnamese and the United States, and this shows that Americans can stand them.

The survey shows overwhelming support for proposals to establish a \$20,000 limit on individual farm payments, a mandatory prison term for anyone who possesses a firearm while committing a felony, and compulsory arbitration of paralyzing national strikes. It also shows overwhelming opposition to busing of school children just to achieve racial balance.

The survey shows strong support for direct controls on wages, prices, profits, interest rates and credit. In view of our wartime experience with similar controls, the 54 per cent affirmative vote was surprising. The extent of opposition to revenue-sharing by the federal government was also unexpected and I may add, gratifying. Almost 40 per cent oppose "no strings attached" sharing of some federal revenues with state governments.

RESULTS OF 1970 OPINION SURVEY

President Nixon has described the Vietnamization program (withdrawal of troops) as "irreversible." If South Vietnam's government shows weakness as it assumes full responsibility for ground action, what should we do about our troops?

Continue to withdraw them..... 8,685
Send more in..... 818
Halt further withdrawals indefinitely. 4,396

If the existence of Israel becomes threatened, should we go to its aid with our own military forces (troops, planes, etc.)?

Yes..... 2,793
No..... 10,655
No opinion..... 1,294

Should the federal government share a portion of its tax revenue with state governments, with no strings attached?

Yes..... 7,806
No..... 5,738
No opinion..... 1,333

Where strikes would paralyze the nation's economy or endanger public health and

safety, should labor disputes be settled by compulsory arbitration?

Yes..... 14,107
No..... 827
No opinion..... 234

Should federal farm programs contain a provision limiting to \$20,000 the amount in government payments any farmer may receive each year?

Yes..... 13,410
No..... 850
No opinion..... 661

Do you favor a mandatory prison term for anyone possessing a firearm while committing a felony?

Yes..... 12,889
No..... 1,335
No opinion..... 825

Should the federal government require transportation of pupils beyond normal geographic school zones for the purpose of achieving racial balance?

Yes..... 814
No..... 14,001
No opinion..... 454

To curb inflation, the Administration has adopted policies which have resulted in higher-than-normal interest rates, an extension of the surtax, and cuts in a number of federal programs (defense, education, public works). Would you prefer direct controls on wages, prices, profits, interest rates, and credit?

Yes..... 7,814
No..... 5,340
No opinion..... 1,394

Are there poor families in your community who should receive more assistance than they get?

Yes..... 3,398
No..... 7,018
No opinion..... 4,010

For agriculture, which of these do you prefer:

Continue present program without change..... 430
Continue present program but place a limit of \$20,000 on total government payments a farmer can receive in one year..... 4,964
Over a 5-year phaseout period, eliminate government crop production payments and price supports, and replace with a program which provides special aids for low-income farmers, lets all farmers grow the crops they wish, and adjusts total output through longterm retirement (competitive bids)..... 8,379

TENNESSEE MEDAL OF HONOR WINNERS HONORED AT HISTORIC VALLEY FORGE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee is immensely proud of its 31 Congressional Medal of Honor winners—including perhaps the most famous, the late Sgt. Alvin C. York of Pall Mall in the storied Upper Cumberland area in the Fourth Congressional District which I am honored to represent in the Congress.

In this connection, the 31 Tennessee recipients of the Nation's highest mili-

tary honor were recently memorialized by the dedication of an area at Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

The publisher of the Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., Comdr. James G. Stahlman, secured the tract for the heroes of the Volunteer State, and he is to be commended for his patriotism and devotion to our country.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most significant event, I include articles concerning the tribute to the State's Medal of Honor winners in the RECORD:

GENERAL MOTT DEDICATES MEMORIAL TO STATE'S MEDAL OF HONOR MEN

VALLEY FORGE, PA.—Tennessee's 31 recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor were memorialized today in a ceremony dedicating a one-acre area of the Congressional Medal of Honor Grove to heroes of the Volunteer State.

The "Tennessee Acre"—one of 52 set aside in the Grove for each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—was the gift of James G. Stahlman, owner and publisher of the Nashville Banner. Through the cooperation of Gov. Buford Ellington and the General Assembly of Tennessee, the state has provided for the perpetual maintenance of this plot.

Maj. Gen. Hugh B. Mott, Tennessee adjutant general, delivered the dedication address, recounting the deeds of each Tennessean whose name appears on a commemorative plaque.

Stahlman was unable to attend the ceremonies. He was represented by Frank van der Linden, chief of The Banner's Washington bureau, who unveiled the Seal of Tennessee on an eight-foot obelisk set on a memorial square in the wooded tract.

Medal recipients from Delaware and Florida also were honored in similar ceremonies which followed a general chapel service and program in the Amphitheater to the Unknown Valiant at Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.

The dedications were part of a Freedoms Foundation program begun in 1964 when the Congressional Medal of Honor Grove was established as a permanent shrine. Eight other states previously have dedicated their areas.

TWO HOLDERS PRESENT

Two Tennessee holders of the medal, Charles H. Coolidge of Signal Mountain and Command Sergeant Major Paul B. Huff of Fort Campbell, and their families were among those present at the dedication. Widows and relatives of seven deceased recipients also accompanied Gen. Mott here in a Tennessee Air National Guard plane Friday.

Two other Tennessee recipients are living, according to reports in the adjutant general's office. They are Charles L. McGaha, still in service and stationed at Fort Benning, Ga., and Vernon McGarity of Memphis.

Freedoms Foundation President Kenneth D. Wells said "The Grove was conceived to commemorate the valor, bravery, courage and sacrifice of our military heroes who earned the nation's supreme decoration and to inspire patriotism and a sense of duty to God and Country in all who visit it."

Gen. Mott said: "For you recipients who are here today and those others not present who somehow came through alive from outstanding heroic deeds, may I say, 'thank you' for all Tennesseans, for all Americans and for all in the free world.

"You have brought glory to the Volunteer State. You have brought honor to your country. You have brought hope for the preservation of man's freedom."

He noted that "these sacrifices for freedom were performed by young men under the age of 30, and I do not hesitate to

remind young Americans today that they must include in their ranks such dedicated and courageous men whose thoughts and deeds are in the interest of all mankind and not themselves.

"On the battlefield of everyday living, youth of today must develop courageous young heroes and heroines dedicated not to the under-30 group, the academic freedom group or certain minority groups but to the preservation of freedom for all."

"ABOVE AND BEYOND"

Gen. Mott entitled his remarks "Volunteers, Above and Beyond" and observed that "in reviewing cases of the various Medal of Honor recipients from Tennessee, it is interesting to note that each had volunteered—each had volunteered extra courage and, in many cases, their lives."

He said use of the word "volunteers" was fitting "since Tennessee is the one state whose nickname is directly applied to military duty."

The term "Volunteer State," Mott recalled, "dates back to the War of 1812 when so many Tennesseans volunteered for service, and was upheld again when the 'Volunteer State' was asked to send 2,800 men to fight in the Mexican War. Instead of 2,800, there were 30,000 volunteers who asked for military duty."

"Tennesseans have answered the call in all military actions in which the United States has been involved, and for a single purpose: the preservation of freedom. And individuals have displayed heroism throughout our nation's history—John Sevier, Andrew Jackson, Davy Crockett, Sam Houston, Nathan Bedford Forrest, Sam Davis, Sgt. Alvin C. York and so on."

The state's chief military leader, himself a holder of the Distinguished Service Cross, the nation's second highest award, for bravery in the seizure of the Remagen Bridge over the Rhine River in World War II, said he had chosen to devote his speech to the actions of each Medal of Honor recipient because "to me, the deeds of these men speak more for the dedication of this tract of land, this Tennessee Acre, this memorial . . . than words I could offer or words anyone else could offer."

SELF-SACRIFICE

"The Medal of Honor," Mott noted, "is the highest military award for bravery that can be given any individual in this nation. It is awarded only to a person performing a deed of personal bravery or self-sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty while a member of the armed forces and in combat with the enemy."

"The act must clearly distinguish gallantry above lesser forms of bravery, and it must be something which if not done would not be the subject of any criticism."

"For all the acts I have mentioned, in no individual case could someone have criticized the soldier, the airman, the Marine or the sailor if he had not performed that act of heroism."

"That . . . is the point we must remember here. These men volunteered above and beyond the call of duty. These men sacrificed. These men are heroes in the very sense of the word hero."

"Duty, honor, country—these were the elements which brought the award of the Medal of Honor to each," Gen. Mott said.

ADMONISHES YOUTH

After admonishing present-day youth to dedicate themselves to the preservation of freedom, Mott said:

"While we remember today these recipients of the Medal of Honor for military action against the enemy, I would like to take time to mention a man who has so served his country and deserves the Medal of Honor for non-military action against the enemy—a modern-day patriot who has done as much for freedom as any other Tennessean, any other

American. I speak of James G. Stahlman, publisher of the Nashville Banner.

"Earlier this month, Mr. Stahlman and another newsman were awarded the American Legion's Fourth Estate Award for 1970 at the national convention in Portland, Ore. This award is given each year 'for distinguished public service in the field of communications' and for furthering the principles of Americanism through the public news media."

"It is the most recent of numerous awards given the distinguished Tennessean for patriotic endeavors. And a most recent patriotic endeavor of Mr. Stahlman was the contribution for the purchase of the Tennessee Acre we dedicate today in the Medal of Honor Grove."

"Mr. Stahlman served as an Army private in World War I and was a Navy captain in World War II—a double-barreled example of patriotism. He has received top awards from the Freedoms Foundation, Americas Foundation, Columbia University and others for patriotic service."

"His contribution here further perpetuates the principles of Americanism to which he is dedicated. For Mr. Stahlman's gesture, I can only say 'thank you' for all Tennesseans, for all Americans. He is another true example of volunteers, above and beyond."

Mott concluded his address with a tribute by the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur to those who have paid the supreme sacrifice:

"His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me, nor from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast . . ."

"I do not know the dignity of their birth, but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we could go on to victory."

About 30 Tennesseans traveled to Valley Forge for the program, most of them with the adjutant general by plane Friday to nearby Willow Grove Air Force Base. About 300 invited guests attended the general program and the three individual state dedications.

Howard H. Callaway of Pine Mountain, Ga., chairman of Freedoms Foundation trustees, was master of ceremonies for the general program. Lt. Gen. Herman Nickerson Jr., USMC (Ret.), delivered the principal dedicatory address.

In another ceremony near the Grove today, Gov. Raymond P. Shafer of Pennsylvania laid the date stone for the new General of the Army Douglas MacArthur Building now under construction. The three-level colonial and red brick building will consist of classrooms, dining facilities and guest rooms.

William B. Walton of Memphis was among the Freedoms Foundation trustees and officials who had an active role in the program.

The Medal of Honor Grove—52 acres of prime woodland—is landscaped in the design of the map of the United States with each state and Puerto Rico in its approximate geographical location. As each state dedicates its acre, it is identified by a memorial square on which is set an eight-foot obelisk bearing the state seal and a bronze plaque listing the state's living and deceased medal recipients.

Within the square, a 30-foot flagpole behind each obelisk flies the state's flag. Meditation benches are on either side of each memorial plot. Glistening stainless steel commemorative plaques, bearing the name, unit and home state of individual recipients as well as the date and place of citation, will be imbedded before trees memorializing each recipient.

Several miles of winding paths connect the 52 memorial areas. The Henry Knox Build-

ing, which houses the records of the heroic deeds of the nation's more than 3,300 medal winners, also is located in the Grove. The building, a gift of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, is named for the nation's first secretary of war.

The Congressional Medal of Honor, awarded by the President in the name of Congress, was established in 1861 by Abraham Lincoln.

The Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge was founded in 1949 to encourage all Americans to understand and defend the rights and responsibilities they enjoy under their constitutional form of government.

TENNESSEE'S LIST OF 31 WINNERS

Following is the list of Tennessee's 31 recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor whose service was memorialized today in the Congressional Medal of Honor Grove at Valley Forge, Pa.:

Charles H. Coolidge, Army technical sergeant, born and entered service at Signal Mountain, World War II. (Attended dedication. Lives at Signal Mountain; connected with Chattanooga printing firm.)

Paul B. Huff, Army corporal, born and entered service at Cleveland, World War II. (Attended dedication. Now a command sergeant major at Fort Campbell.)

Charles L. McGaha, Army master sergeant, entered service at Cosby, World War II. (Still in service, stationed at Fort Benning, Ga.)

Vernon McGarity, Army staff sergeant, born in Stewart County, entered military service at Model, World War II. (Lives in Memphis.)

Joseph B. Adkinson, Army sergeant, born at Atoka, entered service at Memphis, World War I.

Robert L. Bonney, chief watertender, Navy, born in Tennessee (place not recorded), entered service at Nashville, in ship accident, 1910.

Charles P. Cantrell, Army private, born at Smithville, entered service at Nashville, Spanish-American War.

Josephus S. Cecil, Army first lieutenant, entered service at New River, Philippine Insurrection, 1906.

Harrison Collins, Army corporal, born in Hawkins County, Civil War.

Raymond H. Cooley, Army staff sergeant, born at Dunlap, entered service at Richard City, World War II. (Brother, W. O. Cooley of Jasper, attended dedication.)

Ray E. Duke, Army sergeant first class, born and entered service at Whitwell, Korean War (posthumous award). (Sister, Mrs. James London of Tracy City, attended dedication.)

James A. Gardner, Army first lieutenant, born at Dyersburg, entered service at Memphis, Vietnam war (posthumous award). Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dave Gardner of Dyersburg, attended dedication.)

George L. Gillespie, Army first lieutenant, entered service at Chattanooga, Civil War.

George Grant, Army sergeant, born at Raleigh, entrance place unrecorded, Indian campaign, Dakota Territory, 1867.

Allen J. Greer, Army second lieutenant, born and entered service at Memphis, Philippines Insurrection, 1901.

Bolden P. Harrison, Navy seaman, born at Savannah, Philippines Insurrection, 1911 (posthumous award).

Oliver Hughes, Army corporal, born in Fentress County, Civil War.

George Jordan, Army sergeant, born in Williamson County, Indian campaign, New Mexico, 1880.

James E. Karnes, Army sergeant, born at Arlington, entered service at Knoxville, World War I.

Elbert L. Kinser, Marine Corps sergeant, born in Greeneville, World War II (posthumous award).

Gaines Lawson, Army first sergeant, born in Hawkins County, Civil War.

Milo Lemert, Army first sergeant, born in Iowa, entered service at Crossville, World War I (posthumous award).

William F. Lyell, Army corporal, entered service at Old Hickory, Korean War (posthumous award). (Parents, Mr. and Mrs. B. F. Lyell, and sister, Mrs. Richard Bass, of Old Hickory, attended dedication.)

William W. Morris, Army corporal, born in Ireland, entered service in Stewart County, Indian campaign in Texas, 1875.

David R. Ray, hospital corpsman second class, Navy, McMinnville, Vietnam war (posthumous award).

Walter K. Singleton, Marine Corps sergeant, entered service at Memphis, Vietnam war (posthumous award). (Parents, Mr. and Mrs. G. P. Singleton of Memphis, and three children attended dedication.)

Benoni Strivson, Army private, born at Covington, Ky., entered service at Overton, Tenn., Indian campaign in Arizona, 1868.

Edward R. Talley, Army sergeant, born and entered service at Russellville, World War I.

Calvin John Ward, Army private, born in Greene County, entered service at Morristown, World War I. (A nephew, Calvin Sipe of Greeneville, attended the dedication.)

John Harlan Willis, pharmacist's mate first class, Navy, born at Columbia, World War II (posthumous award). (Widow, Mrs. Kenneth Duke of Nashville, attended dedication.)

Alvin C. York, Army corporal, born in Fentress County, entered service at Pall Mall, World War I.

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT U.S. POLICY TOWARD ASIA

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, there arrived in my office several weeks ago a very interesting letter from a constituent of mine who was spending time in Japan. Prof. Francis Joseph Bassett of Millersville State College, formerly taught in Japan and this summer was back in that nation. While there he made some observations about U.S. policy toward Asia and how that policy relates to what is happening on the campuses in this country.

I believe my colleagues might be interested in some excerpts from Professor Bassett's letter, and I enclose them in the RECORD at this point:

I think the situation in Asia (as I have listened to Japanese scholars this summer at Sophia University in Far Eastern Modern History and China: 19th and 20th Century) is in a precarious and dangerous phase. If the anti-war forces can convince enough young Americans on our campuses, faculty, and the general public to start an "isolationist snowball" rolling toward complete withdrawal everywhere, we are in for real trouble. Far from spending that money saved for the ghettos, the likelihood is that the public will ask for a tax cut and spend vast sums for defense for an isolated "fortress America." It happened before in the 1920s and 1930s and we paid a huge price with World War II but today such illusions would be more disastrous.

Most "teach-ins" at colleges are recitals of how terrible is the dictatorship of General Thieu and the Greek colonels but not one word about the total Communist states of North Korea, North Vietnam, Syria, Iraq, Bulgaria, etc. with complete repression and

firing squads. I like my students but wonder how they would survive in a totalitarian society. I have always been moderate in domestic and international questions because I think it is all very complex and cannot be decided by one-sided slogans and discussions. And, Asia is most complex.

The time is rapidly approaching when we should ask ourselves—"what is the end result of immediate complete and total withdrawal from Southeast Asia" and the likelihood that it will snowball into total withdrawal from South Korea, Japan and the Philippines. It will be a disaster for freedom everywhere.

I believe that it is fine for young people to take responsibility in the November elections, but I hope our colleges will not become solely propaganda centers for Marxism or any other ideology (or political centers with all of us asked daily to take sides) to the detriment of the true function of educational institutions. That is what South American colleges have become.

I trust that we will muddle through as we always have in American history, but reading press dispatches one gets the impression that we are "going down the drain." The irresponsible people who wish to destroy Mr. Nixon will end up destroying the presidency and the democratic institutions as well. . . . "There is a large measure of goodwill toward America among the Japanese and in Asia that will hold up well if we keep our cool and turn back the defeatists."

Mr. Speaker, this American scholar on the scene in Asia has documented through experience the case for a responsible American policy toward that area of the world. Furthermore, I think it is interesting that Vice President AGNEW has drawn some of the same conclusions after talking at length with Asian leaders. This common ground by Professor Bassett and our Vice President deserves our careful evaluation.

TRIBUTE TO MR. BEN PRIMM HAZLEWOOD

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this month, my longtime friend Mr. Ben Primm Hazlewood retired from his position as superintendent of the University of Tennessee's Agricultural Experimental Station in Jackson, Tenn. Mr. Hazlewood, who is now 70 years old, served in this capacity for a period of 41 years.

Recently, two of the outstanding periodicals of my district paid tribute to Mr. Ben. The *TenneScene*, a supplement carried by several weeklies, published an article on Mr. Hazlewood by Mr. Bob Parkins, editor of the *Milan Mirror*, and the *Herald Gazette* of Trenton published an article by Mr. A. H. Williams.

Because of Mr. Hazlewood's outstanding contribution to American agriculture, I insert these two articles in the RECORD:

[From the *TenneScene*, August 1970]

WEST TENNESSEE'S CHIEF OF AGRICULTURE WILL LEAVE BEHIND MORE THAN MEMORIES

(By Bob Parkins)

Ben Primm Hazlewood, West Tennessee's grand chief of agriculture, will close out 41 years of service when he retires Sept. 1 as

superintendent of the U-T Experiment Station in Jackson.

But the 70-year-old agricultural pioneer will leave behind much more than memories. During his tenure at the West Tennessee Experiment Station, which began in 1929, agriculture became "revolutionized." And "Mr. Ben" certainly had a hand—a big hand—in the sweeping current of progress that has made America the most efficient food producing nation in the world.

He also brought the station at Jackson to the front with the tremendous growth of the physical plant and an organized staff of specialists from across the state. The Jackson station has also exerted great influence upon agricultural work now being conducted at U-T Martin; the U-T Milan Field Station, and U-T's station at the Amos Plantation near Grand Junction.

"With all those facilities, West Tennessee is now as adequately equipped for research as any section I know of," Mr. Hazlewood said.

But it hasn't always been so. He recalls vividly when he came to Jackson in 1929. He began at the top as superintendent of the station, but it was small then compared to its present site. He had a staff of seven helpers and no secretary, and only 180 acres to work on. Since then, the station has grown to 650 acres and he has a staff of more than 50 persons. This includes a covey of PhD's in agricultural biology, agricultural engineering, entomology, agronomy, horticulture, dairying and weather.

Mr. Hazlewood, born at Smyrna, actually got his first job with U-T as a student in 1919. He did cleaning jobs on the campus and graduated with a B.S. degree in 1923. He stayed on at U-T as a dairy instructor, working on an advanced degree. And in 1926, he was the first student ever to receive a Master's degree in dairying at the institution located in Knoxville.

Before accepting his position at Jackson in 1929, he worked for the City of Knoxville as a dairy health inspector and later as a fieldman for Pet Milk Company.

He feels that the greatest achievement at the Jackson station was its enlargement and expansion in the 1940s. Four hundred and seventy acres were purchased and added to the station, and it has blossomed ever since.

Mr. Hazlewood has watched agriculture advance from mule days to space-age technological progress that few dreamed of 40 years ago. He recalls vividly some of his first work at Jackson which included the development of better mules through a cross-breeding program.

"We owned the last Percheron stallion that came from France, and the big fellow weighing 2,300 pounds attracted folks from all around," he said. "Importing of animals was stopped back then because of a foot and mouth disease outbreak in Europe."

He also recalls the construction of the famed "roundhouse" at the station as symbolic of the facility's spirit of cooperation. It was built as a meeting house for area farmers largely through one-dollar contributions from the farmers who went there for institutes. The cost of the building in 1918 was about \$20,000.

"It has become the traditional landmark of the station," he said. "And, sadly, it has outlived its usefulness and will probably have to be torn down in the future."

He feels the future is bright for dedicated farmers. "Successful farmers today are just like the ones of the past. They are able to be successful under the same conditions that may cause their neighbor down the road to be on starvation."

He rated today's successful farmers as being the most alert businessmen in the nation. "That's because they are making a success in face of increased costs of production and slightly increased prices. In most

businesses increased costs are passed on to the customer."

His formula for successful farming: "Good headwork and putting together facts makes good farmers."

He said "though we're living in a 'do good' era, it is people who make slums—not the society in which they live."

During Mr. Hazlewood's career, he's making hundreds of public addresses, written countless articles and has been very active in civic, church and community work. Named to "Who's Who in the South and Southwest" in 1968, he also was the originator of the famed slogan, "Keep Tennessee Green."

But "Mr. Ben" will move out of the big station home that he and his wife and one daughter occupied for 41 years come Sept. 1. They will move to their new home under construction near Humboldt where Mr. Hazlewood has owned a dairy farm for many years. Their daughter, Miss Jane Hazlewood, is with the Tennessee Public Health Department in Nashville.

What does he plan to do after retirement? "Just visit my old friends and enjoy life," he said. "I don't plan to interfere with my 100-cow dairy operation. Things are going well with it so there's no use in my changing it."

Of course, he'll be around to inject new thoughts and work toward an old goal that's ever-present on his mind. And that is: "More production per unit in every phase of agriculture."

Dr. Pete Gasset, an outstanding U-T Martin graduate, class of 1955, will succeed Mr. Hazlewood as station superintendent.

[From the Trenton Herald Gazette (Tenn.)
Aug. 20, 1970]

(By A. H. Williams)

"Mr. Agriculture!!!"

Should two words be chosen to give one right and proper title to one man, those above, according to the judgment of the writers of These Little Pieces, would be for Ben P. Hazlewood, our "subject" today, who retires on August 31 after having served as Superintendent of the West Tennessee Experiment Station (Agricultural) for the past 41 years. There is no human (or computerized, either) method of evaluating Mr. Hazlewood's contribution to the farming economy of West Tennessee, the State as a whole, and large portions of the entire nation, Rural America, especially, as well as urban areas know and appreciate this fine man. He has been a vital part in advancing the business—big business—of agriculture in this and many other sections from the "one horse plow era" to modern day farming with its mammoth pieces of mechanized and motor driven equipment. He has seen the farm grow from "Pigmy to Giant" in its operative procedure, and HE has been a big part of and directed a large portion of the transition. And in addition to the "Major" in the curriculum of his life's work, he has several "minors" in the fields of civic and religious activities in both "town and country."

Again, it is the extreme pleasure of these writers to present a personal friend in these versatile columns. And, again, are we in the position of being unable to recall ever having formally met a person we have known, it seems, always. The M. M. (Male Member) of this team of scribes has been with Ben often in his favorite civic, luncheon club meetings; at his "place of business"; and in numerous other instances where he, Mr. Hazlewood, somehow in his modest manner seemed to over-shadow those of the entire group who knew that Ben (or "Mr. Ben" if a generation or so may have been dividing the age aspect) was engaged in a profession which lent to the accomplishment of better living for all. And the F. M. (Female Mem-

ber) of this writing team has known him as well and for almost as long.

And, as of this date, for almost a half century, we have never heard an adverse word said about this noble citizen—a man who lived for more than half his life in Madison County; is not a native of Gibson County; but who is now erecting a fine new residence on the Humboldt-Trenton section of U.S. Highway 45W, just north of Humboldt, and is retiring to his "old home" where four generations of his family will have lived. He will be close enough to Jackson to maintain, he says, ties that have become close during his abode there and will be lasting; he will be close enough to Humboldt for her to reclaim him as a "home town boy" and "top citizen"; and near enough to Trenton, Milan and other points in the county and adjacent area to keep his many personal contacts; and so situated that he may "live it up at home" for the balance of his days—which his thousands and thousands of friends hope and expect to be very, very many.

Quoting from the 1967-68 Who's Who in the South and Southeast: "Hazlewood, Ben Primm, Agricultural Researcher; born Smyrna, Tennessee, June 25, 1900; son of Alexander and Georgia K. (Primm) Hazlewood; B.S. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1923, M.S., 1926; married Lennie Jane Sanders, June 30, 1926; one daughter, Eulalia Jane."

"Instructor Dairy Department, University of Tennessee, 1923-26, Dairy Inspector, City of Knoxville, 1926-1927; Fieldman, Pet Milk Company, Greenville, 1927-29; Superintendent, University of Tennessee's West Tennessee Experiment Station, Jackson, 1929-70; Member Delta Tau Delta; Presbyterian, Elder and Trustee; Rotarian (President 1936-37); Contributor of articles to professional journals; Home: 605 Airways Blvd., Jackson, Tennessee."

Space prevents our giving but minute details on the active life and experiences of this devoted public servant to and for the State of Tennessee.

Since graduating from Fitzgerald-Clark Preparatory School in 1919, Mr. Hazlewood has been associated with the University of Tennessee continuously as a student, an instructor, University associated projects, and Superintendent of West Tennessee Experiment Station.

In October, 1919, after matriculating in September, he did his first work for the University offices. Later he became a part-time instructor in the Department of Vocational Training, this department being conducted for Veterans of World War I with less than a high school education. Later he became a full-time instructor in the department, teaching dairying.

In 1924 the City of Knoxville adopted the U.S. Public Health Standard Milk Ordinance. Dr. M. Jacob, later dean of the College of Agriculture, U.T., served as part-time employee of the City of Knoxville to supervise the health standards of the Knoxville dairies. After the adoption of this ordinance the details required more attention than Dr. Jacob could give and Mr. Hazlewood was employed to work with him and at the same time pursue his work toward a Masters degree. This Masters degree in dairying was granted in 1926, this being the FIRST Masters degree in this subject ever granted by the University of Tennessee.

In 1927 the Pet Milk Company opened an evaporating plant at Greenville and requested the University to recommend someone to be on their payroll and work with the Greene County people, Agricultural Extension Service and other Agricultural Agencies in developing dairying in their plant area. Mr. Hazlewood was chosen for the job and pursued the work until 1929 when the USDA Dairy Experiment Station was located at

Lewisburg. When the University was asked to recommend a man for the position of Superintendent of the new Station, Ben again "got the nod" and while the USDA was considering the appointment, the Superintendent of the West Tennessee Experiment Station resigned and Mr. Hazlewood was appointed to succeed him and there he's been since October, 1929, guiding the destiny of one of the nation's largest facilities of its kind.

At the time Ben took over the administration of the W.T.E.S. in Jacobson, acreage has been purchased in three tracts, totaling 189. The staff was composed of the Superintendent, seven helpers and no secretary.

Since that time 461 acres have been added, making a total of 650, and the staff is now made up of the Superintendent; 10 department representatives; 22 technical Aids and Plot and Dairy Assistants; four secretaries; and 10 seasonal laborers.

Many have been the activities of the Station. We asked Ben to list some of the things that were especially important besides the actual working on crop improvement and plant advancement over the years. Among the things he mentions are:

Slum Clearance: A subdivision on the north side of Highway 70, between the WTES entrance and Forked Deer River, known as Fairhope Subdivision was developed in the 20's. This development was quite diverse and had proven to be a poor location mainly because of flooding. The development created quite a number of problems for the Experiment Station. In the early 40's provision was made to relocate the residents and make the land a part of the Experiment Station property. There were 27 parcels of property involved. This clearance relieved the station of many problems—and also the occupants—and at the same time added greatly to the appearance of the station property;

1941 River-bottom Drainage and Flood Control: In West Tennessee there are approximately one million acres of riverbottom land. The original Station property (West Tennessee Experiment Station) did not include any of this type area for research work. In 1941 two hundred acres of representative bottom land adjoining the original Station became available and was added to the Station for research in the problems characteristic of this large area. At the same time 200 acres of additional upland, quite representative of West Tennessee, was also added. The addition at that time was primarily for pasture work but lately this upland area has proven to be very helpful in the expansion of small plot work which has always been the main emphasis at the West Tennessee Experiment Station (Authors' note—It is through this "small plot work" that many "discoveries" have been made in plant and crop life which has added to the sum total of the farm wealth of the West Tennessee area in particular).

Through the efforts of Mr. Hazlewood, with cooperation of the Soil Conservation Service, this 400 acres is now in cultivation, much of which was originally swamp.

Pioneer for "Keep Tennessee Green": In the early 30's when dairy products were low in prices, work at West Tennessee Experiment Station showed the economy of using all-year pastures in milk production and the attendant values of soil improving crops and erosion control. The slogan "Keep Tennessee Green" had its origin in this WTES effort to produce dairy products that could be sold profitably. Many phases of no-grain feeding and limited grain feeding were explored. This dairy project was one of the hundreds that have been originated and brought to successful conclusion by Mr. Hazlewood during his long tenure of service to the University of Tennessee through its agricultural department).

PRIVATE UTILITIES SPEND BIG TO COMBAT FEDERAL POWER IN NEW ENGLAND

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues attention to an article appearing on the second page of today's Washington Post, concerning the maneuverings of the private power industry to keep Federal power out of New England.

Written by Post staff writer George Lardner, Jr., the article notes that according to the Federal Power Commission, 17 New England electric utilities spent more than a half million dollars during the years 1964-68 in efforts directed against construction of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project in northern Maine. Apparently, figures for the period 1969 to present were not yet available to the FPC; nor, ostensibly, were sums expended by other private utilities within and outside the New England area for activities aimed at withholding a Federal power "yardstick" from the people who pay the highest prices in the country for their electricity.

Still, the expenditures that were acknowledged to the FPC comprise shocking evidence of the true scope of private power's profit-motivated attempts to defeat both Dickey-Lincoln and the best interests of the people of New England.

On Tuesday, the \$807,000 recommended by the administration and approved by the Senate for continued preconstruction planning of the Dickey facility comes to the floor of this body as an amendment in disagreement to the fiscal 1971 public works appropriations bill. I respectfully urge my colleagues to give due weight to the Lardner article in their consideration of the issue. And I sincerely hope that they will respond favorably to the proven power needs of New England by approving the requested Dickey-Lincoln planning funds.

The Post article follows:

SEVENTEEN NEW ENGLAND ELECTRIC COMPANIES BATTLE FEDERAL POWER
(By George Lardner Jr.)

Seventeen New England electric companies have spent more than half a million dollars campaigning against introduction of a federal power project in the Northeast, according to a report by the Federal Power Commission.

The private utilities listed the costs as "miscellaneous general expenses" in their annual reports to the FPC.

Most of the expenditures were evidently directed at the Dickey-Lincoln public power project, which the private companies have lobbied against with striking success the past four years.

Authorized by Congress in 1965 after a bitter fight, Dickey-Lincoln would be the first government "yardstick" for power costs in a region where consumers pay the highest electric bills in the continental United States.

Some \$2.1 million in planning funds were appropriated that year and the next, but the \$267-million hydroelectric project has been squelched since then, largely due to opposi-

tion in the House where the issue is scheduled to come up for another vote early this week.

Some of the private power company expense figures, which run only from 1964 through 1968, were supplied by the FPC last month in response to a request by Sen. Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.), an outspoken critic of the utility industry. Metcalf released the letter to New England congressmen who favor Dickey-Lincoln.

According to the report, 17 power companies in New England were asked how much they had spent in connection with Dickey-Lincoln and a predecessor project, Passamaquoddy, through two organizations, the Electric Coordinating Council of New England (ECCNE) and the Electric Council of New England (ECNE).

\$567,057 SPENDING CITED

The utilities cited expenditures totaling \$567,057 in the five-year period. The contributions ranged from Boston Edison's \$123,570 to a modest \$959 from the Holyoke Water Power Co.

Besides Boston Edison, other leading contributors were Massachusetts Electric (\$77,213); Connecticut Light & Power (\$67,749); Central Maine Power Co. (\$60,723) and Hartford Electric Light Co. (\$47,756).

The Electric Coordinating Council, which is composed of top utility company executives, has done much of the lobbying against Dickey-Lincoln. The Electric Council is more of a trade association, turning out advertising and compiling statistics.

The FPC report did not include any details on how the money was spent. However, a "Report for Action" on Dickey-Lincoln, prepared by three New England utility company officials around 1965, suggested an overall, industry campaign that might effectively combat "a Federal power network in our region."

RECOMMENDATIONS CITED

The recommendations included "development of feature stories, editorials, commentaries . . . a coordinated advertising program . . . appointment of a Congressional liaison team . . . contact with New England civic and political organizations" as well as "assistance from labor unions who have an interest in our business," such as the United Mine Workers.

(The UMW Welfare and Retirement Fund this year reported common-stock investments of \$44.1 million in private power and utility holding companies across the country.)

The Federal Power Commission cited several justifications offered by the 17 utilities for listing the ECCNE and ECNE contributions as "miscellaneous general expenses," apparently a touchy point with FPC accountants.

UTILITIES CITE "DUTY"

"We believe we have a duty to our customers and stockholders to study any proposal that may affect the company's existing or proposed operations," one utility reported. "It is essential that data be developed in such a way that it may be presented before regulatory or other governmental bodies when the occasion should arise."

Another company said the New England utilities "had an obligation to independently evaluate the Dickey-Lincoln and Passamaquoddy proposals" for its customers. Still another reported that "most of these costs represented shared expenses for services by various public relations councils and engineering firms. The engineering evaluations were used to support presentations to Congress and others in opposition to those projects."

Dickey-Lincoln's proponents say the proposed dams on northern Maine's St. John River would save users \$9 million a year and step up the peak-hour capacity New England

so badly needs to prevent blackouts and brownouts. The private companies call it a waste of taxpayer's money on a problem they can handle more efficiently.

Whatever their merits, the utility lobby's presentations have been attacked as less than straightforward. In 1967, for example, the chairman of the Electric Coordinating Council, Albert A. Cree, sent Senate-House conferees debating that year's appropriation request a study entitled: "Federal Power Commission Review Confirms Dickey-Lincoln Project Economically Inefficient."

FIGURE JUGGLING CHARGED

Lee C. White, then FPC Chairman, responded that the Commission had made no such conclusion, but on the contrary had found Dickey-Lincoln "well justified." In House debate earlier this year, Rep. John E. Moss (D-Calif.) charged that the private power companies had repeatedly "juggled figures in mailings to members of this body and presented misleading advertising programs in opposition to the project."

The House, however, led by Rep. Robert N. Giallardo (D-Conn.) voted down the \$807,000 appropriation sought for the current fiscal year to continue planning work. The Senate subsequently approved the expenditure as part of the multi-million-dollar public works appropriations bill, but House conferees last week refused to go along.

The conference report, calling for a separate vote on Dickey-Lincoln, is expected to reach the House floor today or Tuesday. According to some of its less optimistic supporters, that may well be the end of it.

SOUTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in view of the disastrous southern school desegregation situation which is tearing the very heart and soul out of any hopes for our young students to obtain a quality education, I have today sent President Nixon a message vividly detailing the plight which has beset my home district in Mobile, Ala.

I have continuously implored the President to back up his original request for a neighborhood school system without the need for forced busing of pupils by unloading some of the stubborn radical members of HEW and the Justice Department who have completely ignored his instructions in this matter. Thus far, there has been no indication of any degree of positive response by the White House to my pleas. Hopefully, this latest communication I have sent the President will bring about the practical and rational type of action needed to counteract the turmoil already created.

The contents of my message to President Nixon follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I feel it imperative that you should know the full details of the school situation that exist at the present time in Mobile County, Alabama, as a result of the recent Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals desegregation orders.

In a few words, the school situation we have now in Mobile can best be termed as one comprised of no education and very little integration.

As I have personally discussed with you earlier, I honestly feel that it is the earnest desire and intent of our people to do what is right in this situation, but the unworkable and impractical districts drawn up by the Fifth Circuit Court have created a very explosive climate in Mobile County.

Our schools opened the middle of last week on a one-half day schedule and on Monday, September 14, we began classes full time. In one school in particular, Murphy High School, utter chaos has resulted and parents are now removing their children in great numbers because of their well founded fear of actual physical harm being done to these young people.

In the last few hours, a plea has come forth from the faculty members of Murphy High School requesting that Federal Marshals be sent in to maintain necessary order. Our local police force has been doing a fine job of maintaining law and order, but we all realize that they cannot and should not continue to patrol the school and its grounds during the full nine months of the school year.

Proper education cannot come about under police state enforcement. We cannot expect

our children, both black and white, to receive any measurable degree of education under such conditions.

As reported in the national press, the events at Murphy High School during this week have appeared to be of a minor nature; several arrests for disorderly conduct, and a fist fight or two. Actually, two or three faculty members have been attacked and roughed up, female students have been improperly approached and insulted and many cases of attempted robbery or "shake downs" have been reported. The situation has reached the point where many families, although they cannot afford it, have removed their children from the public school system and enrolled them in private institutions. Others are enrolled in high schools in order to complete their high school education as safely as possible. Still others are just dropping out of school.

To further point out the seriousness of the situation and the fact that the Fifth Circuit Court's plan is not working, I submit to you the following enrollment and attendance figures as reported to me:

Mobile area high schools	No. of students assigned as per 5th Circuit Court U.S. plan No. 713		Number attending Sept. 9		Number attending Sept. 14	
	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White
Murphy	1,027	1,300	1,825	844	1,348	409
Booker T. Washington	709	748	725	58	744	17
Blount	1,693	1,022	1,540	35	1,952	48
Williamson	491	824	508	219	577	242

Again, Mr. President, the people of Mobile appeal to you to find a more workable and equitable solution to the school integration problem we have. We realize the Board of Education is and has been under court order and that one cannot simply wave a magic wand and overturn these decisions.

Steps must be taken, however, through your office and through the Attorney General to eliminate the present crisis so as to insure the proper education, safety, and well being of all of the school children in the Mobile area.

Mr. President, I have tried to point out to you and the Attorney General over the last year that the Mobile area faced serious problems. I have pleaded with those in your administration who have been forcing our back to the wall to give us some relief. But we have received no help and now have the chaotic situation which I predicted.

It is most unfortunate that the administration, in a blind effort to integrate, has shown so little interest in the quality education which we so desperately need.

MAJORITY OF YOUNG AMERICANS ARE DEDICATED TO HELPING OUR COUNTRY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following is a thoughtful letter written by a young constituent of mine, J. Robert Schmidt, son of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Schmidt, of Farmington, Ill., to the editor of the Farmington Bugle.

As Mr. Schmidt points out, and rightly so, older adults often judge our young people on the actions of a few misguided ones. We would do better to follow the advice of the old song:

Accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative, latch onto the affirmative.

I would certainly agree with this student that the vast majority of young Americans are dedicated to helping our country, not to tearing it down. I am sure you will agree with me after reading his fine letter:

AUGUST 22, 1970.

To the editor:

With nine years' service in various levels of student government as background, it appears that I shall soon be testifying before various public and private committees whose concern centers on the causes and cures of student unrest and rioting. Since the immediate inspiration for my remarks has been the magnificent job now being done by the Young Folk, I would like to dedicate my ideas to their example, and specifically credit to their work a part of the closing statement of my testimony; which is as follows:

In these times when we are practically taught by many of the "opinion forming" influences of our (i.e. the news media of radio and T.V., the major magazine publications, etc.) that young people are now primarily anti-establishment, pill-pushing, riot starting traitors to the American way, the greatest crime is not—perhaps—that these things do happen, but that all college students are saddled with the blame for these actions. I respectfully repeat that those who represent this destructive state of mind number no more than about five percent of the collegiates on each campus. The vast majority of students are interested in educating themselves into becoming constructive citizens whose goal is building a better world for all to enjoy.

In truth, I am eternally tired of my generation being always associated with such names as Jerry Rubin, Rennie Davis, and Tom Hayden, and of young people being so often unjustly aligned only with the actions of popping pills and committing crimes. Such deeds do occur—but, they are committed by individuals, not by the masses; they are the "scene" of a small minority, not of the vast majority of young people. It

would be far more fair and just if this generation were openly associated with such names as: Cathy Frye, Marilyn Allen, Clarence Lewis, Jill Laceyfield, Mike Andrews, and Doug Rodehaver. For these are the names of only a few of the teen-agers who comprise the singing group known as the Young Folk, an organization dedicated to doing something constructive, and to bringing musical beauty into the world. Donating their time, and energies, and skills, these young people (and their predecessors) have given joy and delight to the audiences of the Heart of Illinois Fair for the past five years. Yet far more than these feats in past years the receipts from the sale of their LP record album have been donated to the Peoria County Youth Farm.

In short, these teen-agers like most young people are trying to help out in whatever way they can—for the benefit of others. These "young folk" are not working on revolution; they are working on songs and choreography which will bring a brief moment of joy and laughter to the hearts of all who will hear them. These "young folk" are not out selling drugs; they are singing—singing out to thousands each day the ideals of love, and happiness, and brotherhood. These "young folk" are not burning America down; they are building America up by bringing to themselves, and all who can hear them, a brief in the youth of this great land of liberty and freedom.

Sadly, should tomorrow some youth be caught committing a social wrong, the meager acknowledgment or attention given their good work by the public at large would be swept away as small trees are blown down before an Illinois tornado. Herein lies the real challenge for all adults and this committee—to not only stop associating all young people with evil, but to realize that most young folk are basically better than even average, and help them to remain that way. What is always needed, in ever increasing amounts, is a commitment by the adults of every community to helping young people achieve their goal of building an America that is always free, equal, and beneficial for all. Applause or even financial support for the Young Folk is not nearly enough; few can fill the special requirements of this excellent singing group. Substantial support for all such groups—as the various student government associations, the Peace Corps, Vista, "Hot Line", YMCA and YWCA, Young Republicans or Young Democrats, church organizations, and special charities—hundreds of these only will fill the bill.

Today's youth really do know "where the action is"; it is in building for the future. If the adult world want college students to continue to believe that "this is where it's at," they are going to have to stop criticizing the evil, and start praising the good—and help the good to get better. Only in this way will the Young Folk always be able to be the excellent example that they are of ninety-five percent of today's youth.

J. ROBERT SCHMIDT,

President Emeritus, Student's Senate,
Illinois Central College.

ISRAEL BOND COMMITTEE OF
CLEVELAND HONORS SEBASTIAN
LUPICA

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I take note

of a special and very meaningful celebration which will take place in my community on September 27, 1970, when Mr. Sebastian Lupica, secretary of the Cleveland Federation of Labor, will be honored by the Israel Bond Committee of Cleveland.

Mr. Lupica is a native Clevelander who has come up through the ranks of organized labor, until, in 1962, he became executive secretary of the 150,000 member Cleveland area AFL-CIO Federation of Labor. Sebastian's career in Labor began in 1934 when he joined the Painters Union. He was elected a business representative of the Painters District Council No. 6 in 1939 and became executive secretary of the council in 1952.

One of his major accomplishments in the Painters District Council was the creation of the Painting and Decorating Institute—an organization in which the union and the painting contractors joined together to promote more work for their industry. The institute has been a remarkable success and has received international publicity as an outstanding example of how labor and management can cooperate for the mutual benefit of both. PDI has been credited with producing more jobs for union painters and more profits for painters and more profits for painting contractors in the Cleveland area.

During Mr. Lupica's term of service as executive secretary, he has increased the participation of the Cleveland AFL-CIO in community affairs. Officers of the federation, including Sebastian, have become directors of the Greater Cleveland Growth Board—another demonstration of his philosophy of labor-management cooperation in an effort to attract industry to the Cleveland area.

Mr. Lupica has been particularly active in the effort to improve all levels of education. He has fought for the equal rights of minority groups. He has labored for better living conditions for America's retired citizens; he has worked for medicare; he has been the founder of Federation Towers, the major retirement apartment center sponsored by the Cleveland AFL-CIO.

It may seem unusual that a man of Italian extraction, Sebastian Lupica, will be conferred upon with such a high honor by the Jewish people of a great community like ours. Yet, it is perfectly in keeping with the life and spirit of Sebastian Lupica who has shown dedication and commitment to all of the people of our community. It is also understandable and in keeping with the spirit of the Jewish community of Greater Cleveland that they recognize freely and with deep affection a friend like Sebastian Lupica who has toiled tirelessly for the betterment of the people of the Jewish faith in our community and in Israel—as well as people of all other ethnic strains who reside in Cleveland.

It is a great source of pride to all of us who see a genuine, tangible expression of brotherhood of this magnitude with its outpouring of love and affection for Mr. and Mrs. Sebastian Lupica.

It is equally heartening to me to see

this vast outpouring of love for this outpost of democracy, the tiny nation of Israel, which, in these times of stress, is so much in need of tangible expressions of faith and covenant in our mutual ways of life.

UNION PACIFIC EXPLORATION

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt, our first President to make natural resources a subject of major personal and national concern, once remarked that true conservation included development as well as preservation. We are fortunate to live in an age which has learned to utilize its mineral resources while simultaneously making every effort to preserve the beauty of our landscape and the ecological balance.

In this spirit, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Span, the quarterly magazine of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana. The article discusses the recent purchase of the oil and gas exploration rights on 7.5 million acres of land along the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah by the Pan American Petroleum Corp., a subsidiary of Standard Oil.

This immense area has tremendous potential and, in the course of its development, will have a great impact upon the economy of my State, as well as upon the entire Rocky Mountain region. Although it is Wyoming and her neighbors who will be the primary beneficiaries in terms of jobs and collateral business transactions, the Nation, as well, will be benefited by these hitherto untapped sources of fuel. I, therefore, include the interesting article, "Exploration Along the Union Pacific," in the RECORD:

EXPLORATION ALONG THE UNION PACIFIC

There the Union Pacific railroad crosses the center of Rocky Mountain oil country, our company has launched an intensive new search for oil and gas.

The 7.5 million acres of Union Pacific land involved is probably the largest single U.S. area ever optioned for exploration to a single oil company. The block includes some of the most prospective onshore undeveloped oil and gas property in the nation.

Many portions of the option area in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah, are virtually unexplored by the drill bit although the area encompasses parts of six major and three lesser geologic provinces where substantial oil production has existed for over a half century. Substantial oil and gas reserves are believed to exist either on or near the acreage we are exploring.

Under the contract with Union Pacific, our company holds exclusive oil and gas exploration rights on 75 per cent of the acreage covered by the agreement. Union Pacific retains all rights in the other 25 per cent.

The acreage—in a strip roughly 40 miles wide along the railroad right-of-way—is in a checkerboard pattern, rather than a solid block. It does not include U.P. lands where our company and others hold production that was developed prior to the present agreement.

"During the initial three-year contract,

we will spend or cause to be spent at least \$15 million on exploration," explained William T. Smith, vice president and Denver division manager of Pan American Petroleum Corporation, our U.S. subsidiary for exploration and production.

"The \$15 million includes our money," he adds, "as well as expenditures by other operators, which we encourage by financial or other support of their exploratory activities."

The encouraging potential of the Union Pacific area is reflected in the fact that nine gas and six oil wells drilled in the first seven months after the contract was signed are indicated to be potential producers. Further drilling will be required to fully evaluate the significance of these indicated discoveries.

Exploration and drilling done to date are, however, just the beginning of the extensive search. A vast amount of the Union Pacific acreage—an area bigger than the combined size of Delaware, New Jersey, and Rhode Island—is yet to be evaluated through geologic and seismic exploration and drilling.

To assure a thorough but rapid evaluation of oil and gas prospects in this large area, a cost-sharing strategy was developed. Through several types of agreements, our company encourages other oil operators to participate in the exploration program.

"This approach," says Smith, "allows us to concentrate our financial and personnel resources in areas where we feel the potential is greatest. Also, the joint operations allow us to benefit from the experience of the other operators in the area."

Our exploration drilling program is now most active in the evaluation of Union Pacific acreage in the Denver-Julesburg Basin, where our company has been one of the largest producers for several years. Thirteen of the 15 discoveries made so far are in this basin, and an estimated 250 of the first 300 wells will be drilled there.

Existing production in the Denver-Julesburg Basin extends north to south across a portion of the Union Pacific lands, and our geologists believe that this unexplored acreage has excellent productive potential.

"This part of the Union Pacific block is familiar geologic territory to us," says Don Hembre, Pan American district geologist, "and if we are successful in quickly finding new reserves here, we can recover drilling costs and help finance our longer-range exploration program."

Outside of the Denver-Julesburg Basin we are carrying out the following work:

Utah: This is the least-explored area of the Union Pacific acreage, and we are concentrating on geologic and seismic exploration to locate prospective drilling sites. Early studies indicate large accumulations of oil and gas may exist here.

Wyoming: Over half the Union Pacific acreage involved falls within five diverse geologic basins in this state. Since major oil and gas fields have previously been discovered in these basins, drilling as well as seismic and geologic studies are under way in an effort to locate additional large reserves.

In Wyoming's Washakie Basin, for instance, a recent gas discovery within the Union Pacific right-of-way tested gas at the rate of 25 million cubic feet per day from about 6,800 feet.

Deep prospect wells in excess of 10,000 feet will also be drilled in Wyoming. Such wildcats can cost several hundred thousand dollars each. (In contrast, a typical wildcat in Colorado's Denver-Julesburg Basin is drilled to about 6,000 feet and on the average costs about \$20,000.) The deep Wyoming wells have a potential of finding major accumulations of oil and gas.

Colorado: Southeast of the Denver-Julesburg Basin, we are conducting subsurface geologic studies. Many wells will be required to define the complex, hard-to-find oil and gas traps we expect.

One such drilling area is in the Las Animas

Arch, near the Colorado-Kansas border. Prospects are good, as indicated by multiple discoveries in the area during the last three years.

Randolph Yost, Indiana Standard director and president of Pan American, says:

"Besides the exceptionally good prospects for substantial reserves, the Union Pacific acreage is in an area laced by existing oil and gas pipelines, near centers of supply, and well served by rail and highway transport."

"Our exploration activities," he adds, "are stimulating Rocky Mountain oil industry activity, with beneficial effects to the economy now and in future years."

PLAN MIGHT REDUCE ELECTRIC RATES

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources of the House Government Operations Committee held a series of hearings on matters affecting the lower Potomac estuary and Charles County in my congressional district.

At that time I presented my views on the proposed Pepco generating station at Sandy Point, Md., to the members of the subcommittee. The controversy regarding the proposed plant stems from the fact that, while the Washington Metropolitan area needs additional electrical power to prevent blackouts and shortages of electricity, we want to insure that the plant does not prove disastrous to the fishlife in the lower Potomac. Charles County certainly needs increased tax resources and this plant would be desirable from that point of view.

I suggested to the subcommittee, as an interim or even long-range alternative measure, that Pepco, and the public service commissions in the area consider restructuring their rates so that residents of the area will be encouraged to use less, not more, electricity.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when this proposal was reported by the news media, it was assumed—erroneously—that electrical rates would be raised or that I was in favor of higher rates. This is not true. My plan would probably result in a reduction in the cost of electricity for many consumers. The object of the plan would be to discourage a squandering of electricity.

For the benefit of those who may have been misled about the intent of this proposal, I include my testimony before the Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH HEARINGS ON THE POTOMAC ESTUARY, JULY 21 AND 22, 1970

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate having this opportunity to submit to you my concern and thoughts on these matters affecting the lower Potomac estuary and Charles County, within my Congressional District.

HULKS IN MALLOWS BAY

Regarding the 110 abandoned ship hulks which have been in Mallows Bay and Wide Water on the Potomac River for some 46 years, Congress enacted legislation in 1968 authorizing the removal of these hulks. The primary justification for their removal was the danger posed to river traffic by floating hulks and pieces which would break loose from time to time.

From information I have been able to gather, general interest in their removal ranges from lukewarm to completely cold. Since coming into office on January 3, 1969, I have not received so much as one letter or contact requesting the removal of the hulks or inquiring as to why the hulks had not been removed as authorized by Congress.

Although certain residents of the immediate area of Mallows Bay may desire to have these hulks removed for one reason or another, others consider them interesting, not unattractive and part of the ecology. I feel that neither group would approve of the expenditure of \$350,000 in Federal and State tax money for their removal, which is the amount the Corps of Engineers stated would be required to remove and dispose of the hulks.

The Corps of Engineers, in fact, does not consider their removal necessary to assure safe navigation of the River, and has stated that for approximately \$50,000 to \$70,000 certain of the hulks could be anchored to prevent their ever being a danger to navigation. Even officials of the Potomac Electric Power Company, as you have noted, indicate a lack of interest in whatever action is taken on the hulks which are near the site of their proposed generating station at Sandy Point.

After assessing the situation and recognizing the need to reduce expenditures on the federal and state levels, I can find no compelling reason for their removal and would consider the expenditure of \$350,000 for this purpose at this time excessive and wasteful and one which I could not justify to my constituents, including Charles Countians.

Evidently the Maryland State Legislature feels as I do because on two occasions proposals to appropriate funds to cover Maryland's 50% share of the costs of removal of the hulks, as required by Section 116a of the River and Harbors Act of 1968, have been deleted from appropriation measures.

I propose that the Corps of Engineers be instructed to take whatever action is necessary to stabilize these hulks to insure they do not constitute a threat to navigation of the Potomac River and that we, thereafter, leave for the pleasure of the herons, egrets, the American Bald Eagles, and the striped bass these unique islands which have grown out of these hulks and have come to be the home of a variety of wildlife over the years.

PEPCO GENERATING STATION, SANDY POINT

I consider the proposed PEPCO station at Sandy Point to be merely one example of a situation which we will have to face again and again. The Potomac Electric Power Company presently has six power plants located in the Washington area. With growing population and increasing demands for power, we can assume that in ten more years there will be a need for more generating stations, and similar situations will present themselves throughout the country.

Regarding the proposed Sandy Point station, I have two general areas of uncertainty. First, in regard to the effects on the water. PEPCO has stated that the water returned to the river will meet Maryland's maximum thermal standard of 90 degrees without a cooling tower. While four or more barges of oil per day will have to be hauled up the Potomac River from Piney Point to Sandy Point, the company gives assurances that precautions will be taken to prevent oil spills.

Further assurances have been given that the sewage treatment plant to be located at the site will meet federal standards. The main thought which crosses my mind at this point is while all these minimum standards might be met and all precautions might be taken, we are still going to be polluting and will be greatly risking serious pollution of the water in an area where the livelihood of a great many residents is derived from the Potomac River.

The standards referred to, do not prohibit sewage from being pumped into the Potomac. Precautions against oil spills do not prevent accidents which are bound to happen with the daily hauling of so many oil barges some distance up the Potomac.

Various interested marine biologists and commissions have unanimously expressed concern and uncertainty over the effects of thermal pollution upon the fish and shellfish-life in the lower Potomac, as well as uncertainty as to the effects of the 90 degree water temperature permitted under Maryland standards on the eggs and larvae in spawning beds throughout the lower Potomac.

Inasmuch as Southern Maryland bordering the lower Potomac, downstream is one of the few areas in which the water and air are still able to sustain fish and the landscape remains virtually unscarred in its natural beauty, you can understand my concern over the introduction of a possible new polluting force in the area.

The use of this particular site on the Potomac is also highly questionable because of the promising aspects of the development of Maryland Neck area for recreational purposes and because of the location of spawning beds for striped bass.

I urge that Pepco and the industry develop technological procedures which will provide much greater guarantees against thermal pollution and oil spills and we can be more certain that the fishlife in the lower Potomac will not be endangered.

As an interim or even long-range alternative measure to prevent blackouts or shortages of electricity in the Metropolitan area, I propose to Pepco and the public service commissions in the area that they consider restructuring their rates so that residents of the area will be encouraged to use less, not more, electricity. Under present rates, which are greatly reduced after a certain amount of kilowatts are consumed, people are encouraged to, and do, greatly waste electricity. This could be discouraged by establishing across-the-board rates for all electricity used, or by the setting of a reasonable rate for a reasonable amount of kilowatts, and charging higher or premium rates for electricity used in excess thereof.

I put these forth to the Subcommittee Members and interested parties in the hope that they will be of some value in balancing the needs of the environment against those of industry.

I would like to interject at this point that these two situations, the removal of the hulks and the location of the Pepco station, very much point up the need for the Potomac River Basin Compact which would provide a suitable mechanism for coordination of all aspects of water resources planning, utilization and preservation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE PRESIDENTIAL TRIP

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, September 15 it was announced that the President would visit Europe. The trip is focused primarily on the Mediterranean area.

A special dispatch to the New York Times from Paris indicates that our French allies are "piqued" because the President "is understood to have turned down an invitation to visit Paris" during his trip.

There is unhappiness in other quarters with the President's itinerary. I place in the RECORD the Times article and a statement issued September 16 by a representative of the Basque movement for autonomy within Spain.

These items indicate that Presidential visits to foreign nations are very important foreign policy instruments. They have a high symbolic value.

The itinerary for the present trip avoids, evidently, a stop in Greece. I find that a very wise choice. I sincerely hope that the remaining itinerary has been as carefully planned. The protests voiced in the items which follow indicate that some sources question that planning.

FRENCH BELIEVED PIQUED

PARIS, September 16.—President Nixon is understood to have turned down an invitation to visit Paris during his forthcoming European tour.

French officials are believed to be piqued by the refusal because the White House was reported to have explained that in the short time Mr. Nixon would have for the trip he wishes to concentrate mainly on Mediterranean countries.

One of the main objects of President Pompidou's foreign policy has been to build up France as a power in the Mediterranean. The invitation by Mr. Pompidou was reported to have been transmitted by ambassador Charles Lucet and the United States reply made it look as if Washington did not consider France to be a major power in the Mediterranean.

There has been no public display of French displeasure. After a Cabinet meeting this morning, Leo Hamon, the Government spokesman, dwelt instead on the difficulty of reconciling the two Presidents' schedules. Mr. Nixon is due to end his trip Oct. 5 and Mr. Pompidou is to leave for Moscow the next day.

BASQUES REACT AGAINST NIXON VISIT TO SPAIN

In connection with the visit of President Nixon to Spain announced yesterday, the official spokesman here of the Basque Government-in-exile, Mr. Xavier de Irujo, has made public today the following statement:

"The visit of President Nixon to Spain could not be more untimely nor more harm-

ful to both the long and short term interests of the United States vis-à-vis all political and social strata of Spain. The President's visit undoubtedly will exacerbate the anti-American feelings, unfortunately already too strong, among all segments of Spanish society.

"When the first rumors about such a visit started circulating, the Basque Government-in-exile and the political and labor forces inside the Basque country which support it, expressed to the American Embassy in Madrid (and more recently to the State Department in Washington) their concerns about the disastrous impact such a Presidential visit could have in the present Spanish political context.

"The Government of General Franco is passing through a very difficult situation because of the notorious scandal created by the corruption, embezzlement and negligence in the administration of public funds. Almost all Cabinet Ministers, including the Vice-President of the Government, Admiral Luis Carrero Blanco, and Foreign Minister Gregorio Lopez Bravo are implicated. The State Department is very aware of the scandals. Certainly the White House is not ignorant of them. The Spanish Supreme Court is investigating them now and criminal proceedings have been started. These events have been widely reported in recent months in the world press.

"The visit of President Nixon is the culmination of a series of clumsy actions which U.S. diplomats in Spain—especially the Ambassador, Mr. Hill—have committed during the last months, alienating the best elements of public opinion in Spain. We Basques, sincere friends of the United States can only make public in the strongest terms our condemnation of actions taken for the sake of political expediency, but which could have tragic consequences and affect a problem as serious and sensitive as the evolution of Spain toward a democratic system. This evolution would permit Spain's full integration—politically, economically, and militarily—into a democratic Europe now in process of political and social unification. The President, through his visit, renders a disservice to this movement for democracy and freedom, principles which are indivisible and universal. Reflecting the general feeling of the Basque people, we denounce the visit of President Nixon as detracting from these lofty principles and as a stab in the back of those moderate elements of Spain, both inside and outside Franco's regime, who are striving to accelerate the progress toward genuinely democratic and stable government which is the only sensible way to avoid another bloody holocaust like the Spanish Civil War of 1936. We feel, by our protest, that we fulfill our duty in the present circumstances: history and future events in Spain will pass judgment on all of us."

FESTIVAL OF SAN GENNARO

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Saturday marked the last day of the 10-day feast of San Gennaro. San Gennaro, the Italian form of Saint Januarius, is a feast widely observed by Neapolitan and Italian populations. In New York City, it was a time for a colorful and happy celebration among members of the Italian community.

It is said that the Bishop of Naples in the later part of the third century was

to have visited Sosinus, deacon of Miseno, who had been imprisoned with other Christians during the persecution of Diocletian. Arrested and thrown to wild beasts, all were beheaded at Possuoli, Campania. Relics of the Bishop were brought to the Church of San Gennaro near the Solfatara and later removed to the Abbey of Monte Vergine. In 1947, they were returned to Naples and enshrined in the cathedral church.

The martyrdom of San Gennaro was observed on September 19. His role as patron saint of Naples has endeared his festival to the people of that city and is celebrated in other cities as well.

I believe, too, that it has even wider significance at this time for it is one method of fostering understanding between different cultures in our society. Thousands of people of all racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds thronged the streets of downtown New York to partake in the joyousness of the festival.

The feeling of a common heritage among Italians is strong and rightly so. Yet here was an important opportunity for many different people to sample parts of that cultural heritage, gain a better understanding of its meaning, and to enjoy its festivities.

The festival of San Gennaro has ended; I hope that this lesson will remain with us.

NATIONAL BLOOD DONOR MONTH

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a paradox exists in this age of scientific advancement. The uses of blood for surgery and for treatment of the sick and injured are multiplying daily. At the same time, blood donors—who for all our medical miracles remain the only source of this life-sustaining fluid—are failing to respond in numbers sufficient to meet the need.

It takes from 6 to 15 units—pints—of fresh blood to perform an open-heart operation. Major cancer surgery relies heavily on transfusions and organ transplants, becoming more commonplace all the time, are creating extraordinary demands for blood.

The uses of the components of whole blood, such as packed red cells, platelets, and cryoprecipitates, for controlling hemorrhage and treating victims of blood disorders, are increasing also, saving lives and adding a new dimension to transfusion therapy.

Based on today's usage, it is estimated that one out of every 80 persons in the United States will require a transfusion within the next year; that the demand for blood is growing at a rate of 12 percent each year.

On the other hand, it is estimated that less than 3 percent of the eligible blood donor population supplies the total blood requirements of the Nation, and that 75 percent of these donors are repeat donors. Women comprise only 19 percent of all blood donors.

Clearly, we need to convince more non-donors to become first-time donors, to persuade infrequent donors to give more often, and to alert all members of our communities to the moral imperative of providing a constant blood supply, adequate for the protection of all.

Although it is not a pleasant prospect, it is a fact of life that any one of us at any time might require a blood transfusion. When the time comes that we are sick or injured, most of us will readily accept the blood we need, whether or not we, ourselves, have ever been blood donors. Realizing this, should we not share the obligation to give blood in advance of possible need by yourselves or our loved ones, and be glad to give because we are well enough to do so.

Voluntary blood replacements help to reduce the cost of hospital care. If voluntary donors cannot continue to meet the demand for blood, our communities will see an increase in use of the paid donor, who sells his blood for cash. If all donors were paid for their blood, the cost of blood would rise in proportion to these donors' demands and could become exorbitant. This rising cost would be borne, in the long run, by the patient.

A statement of policy adopted by the American Association of Blood Banks declares that "blood for transfusion is human living tissue and not a commodity." If we condone the buying and selling of blood for profit, we engender commercial trafficking in blood which could lead also to the sale of human organs, such as hearts and kidneys, which will be needed for transplant operations. Voluntary blood donors, who share gifts of blood to help others, are performing a unique service for their communities and their fellow man. If we abandon this element of personal giving, something of value will be lost to all of us.

Last year I introduced a House Joint Resolution to establish January of each year as National Blood Donor Month. Historically, January has been a most difficult month to obtain sufficient voluntary donors to meet the Nation's blood requirement resulting from winter illnesses, holiday absences, and often weather. The Congress passed and the President did proclaim January 1970 as National Blood Donor Month.

Dr. Enold H. Dahlquist, Jr., president of the American Association of Blood Banks has informed me that as a result of the publicity given to this proclamation the almost nationwide shortages of 1968 and 1969 were not repeated. Many blood banks reported an increase in volunteer donors as high as 25 percent over January 1969. This is especially encouraging for when a person gives once he discovers his fears of donating blood to be groundless and he often becomes a regular donor.

I have again introduced a joint resolution to establish January of each year as National Blood Donor Month. I urge your early support of this resolution for I am convinced this action will serve to remind the public of the critical need for blood as well as the need for the public to rededicate themselves to the voluntary concept of blood donation.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the President, at Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kans., on September 16, made a very forceful and descriptive speech of some of the problems connected with violence and chaos on the campuses of the universities of this country. Although there were some 40 objectors, thousands gave him a tremendous hand and four standing ovations.

Even the President says he does not have all the solutions to the problems of the universities. He is saying that the President alone cannot solve the problems of the universities. This all has to be done by capable and firm administration.

I know that all of us listen to our young people. I happen to have three in my own family in that age group. We cannot always accomplish everything they want but we are happy to listen and to do everything that we possibly can to accommodate their views which we believe are reasonable and in the public interest.

The full text of President Nixon's speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, MANHATTAN, KANS.

Governor Landon, President McCain, Senator Pearson, Senator Dole, all of the distinguished guests on the platform, and all the distinguished guests in this audience for this Landon Lecture Series:

I want to express first on behalf of both Mrs. Nixon and myself our warm appreciation for your welcome. It is good to be on the campus of one of America's great universities. And for the benefit of our television audience, I should explain this tie. We were flying out to Kansas on Air Force One and Senator Pearson, Senator Dole, the Members of the Congressional Delegation and others presented this tie to me and said, "You must wear it when you speak at Kansas State."

So, I put it on. Then the television director for today saw it and said, "You can't wear that tie." I said, "Why not?" He said, "Because purple doesn't go with a blue suit."

All I can say is I am proud to wear the purple of Kansas State.

I also want to thank those who made the arrangements for this meeting for having as the waiting room before we came into the auditorium here, the dressing room for the Kansas State basketball team. It is nice to be in a room with a winner, believe me.

At this great university, in this very distinguished company, I cannot help but think about the twists of fate—and of how we learn from them.

I think of the fans of Wildcat football here today who have known what it is to lose—and then who have known what it is to win.

I think back to 1936. You were not born then. But I think then, when Governor Landon—who already knew what it was to win—the only winner among governors of the Republican side in 1934—a man who knew what it was to win up to that time, learned what it was like to lose.

And I think, too, of some of the moments of my own career: as a football player who spent most of his time on the bench; as a

candidate who knew the great satisfaction of winning—and then as a candidate to learn what it is to lose.

Having won some and lost some, I know—as you know—that winning is a lot more fun.

But I also know that defeat or adversity can react on a person in different ways.

He can give up; he can complain about “a world he never made”; or he can search the lessons of defeat and find the inspiration for another try, or a new career, or a richer understanding of the world and of life itself.

When Alf Landon lost to Franklin Roosevelt in 1936, he was not a man to waste his life in brooding over what might have been. In the 34 years since then, the world has been transformed. And enriched by his experience, Alf Landon has continued to grow with the world—until now he is one of the great elder statesmen of America, a man whose wisdom and common sense, and whose outspoken concern for the welfare of this nation, have inspired and aided generations that have come thereafter.

We applaud him and commend him today for that distinguished career.

Or in a completely different field, but related, take Kansas State and its football team.

As some of you may have noted, I am somewhat of a football buff. Just three years ago, the Wildcats had a dismal seven-year record of eight wins and 60 losses. But there was a dogged spirit here, a determination, a readiness to learn new ways—and when Vince Gibson came to the campus it was that spirit, that determination, that “Purple Pride” that he helped translate into the Purple Power of today.

As for myself, I doubt that I would be President today if I had not learned from the lessons of defeat in 1960 and 1962—and I hope that I can be a better President because of those lessons.

I cite these examples not only to suggest that we here today have something in common—but also because this pattern of playing by the rules, of losing some and winning some, of accepting the verdict and having another chance, is fundamental to the whole structure on which our liberty rests.

There are those who protest that if the verdict of democracy goes against them, democracy is at fault, the system is at fault—who say that if they don't get their way the answer is to burn a bus or bomb a building.

Yet we can maintain a free society only if we recognize that in a free society no one can win all the time. No one can have his own way all the time, and no one is right all the time.

Whether in a campaign, a football game, or in debate on the great issues of the day, the answers to “losing one” is not a rush to the barricades but a study of why, and then a careful rebuilding—or perhaps even a careful re-examination of whether the other fellow may have been right after all.

When Palestinian guerrillas hijacked four airliners in flight, they brought to 250 the number of aircraft seized since the skyjacking era began in 1961. And as they held their hundreds of passengers hostage under threat of murder, they sent shock-waves of alarm around the world to the spreading disease of violence and terror and its use as a political tactic.

That same cancerous disease has been spreading all over the world and here in the United States.

We saw it three weeks ago in the vicious bombing at the University of Wisconsin. One man lost his life, four were injured and years of painstaking research by a score of others was destroyed.

We have seen it in other bombings and burnings on our campuses, and in our cities; in the wanton shootings of policemen, in the

attacks on school buses, in the destruction of offices, the seizure and harassment of college officials, the use of force and coercion to bar students and teachers from classrooms, and even to close down whole schools.

Consider just a few items in the news:

A courtroom spectator pulls out a gun. He halts the trial, gives arms to the defendants, takes the judge and four other hostages, moves to a waiting getaway van—and in the gunfight that follows four die, including the judge.

A man walks into the guardhouse of a city park and pumps five bullets into a police sergeant sitting quietly at his desk.

A Nobel Prize winner working on a cancer cure returns to the cages of his experimental rats and mice to find them vandalized, with some of the animals running loose, some thrown out of windows into the sea, hundreds missing.

Just think, years of research which could have provided some progress to bring a cure to this dread disease destroyed without reason.

A police patrolman responds to an anonymous emergency call that reported a woman screaming. He arrives at the address. He finds the house deserted but a suitcase is left behind. He bends over to examine it. It explodes, blows off his head and wounds seven others.

These acts of viciousness all took place not in some other country, but in the United States, and in the last five weeks.

America at its best has stood steadfastly for the rule of law among nations. But we cannot stand successfully for the rule of law abroad unless we respect the rule of law at home. A nation that condones blackmail and terror at home can hardly stand as the example in putting an end to international piracy or tensions that could explode into war abroad.

The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whatever the purported cause or perpetrators may be. And this is the fundamental lesson for us to remember. In a system like ours, which provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change.

Those who bomb universities, ambush policemen, who hijack airplanes and hold their passengers hostages, all share in common not only a contempt for human life, but also the contempt for those elemental decencies on which a free society rests—and they deserve the contempt of every American who values those decencies.

Those decencies, those self-restraints, those patterns of mutual respect for the rights and feelings of one another, the willingness to listen to somebody else, without trying to shout him down, those patterns of mutual respect for the rights and the feelings of one another—these are what we must preserve if freedom itself is to be preserved.

There have always been among us those who would choose violence or intimidation to get what they wanted. Their existence is not new. What is new is their numbers, and the extent of the passive acquiescence, or even fawning approval, that in some fashionable circles has become the mark of being “with it.”

Commenting on the bombing three weeks ago at the University of Wisconsin, the Wisconsin State Journal recently said:

It isn't just the radicals who set the bomb in a lighted, occupied building who are guilty. The blood is on the hands of anyone who has encouraged them, anyone who has talked recklessly of ‘revolution,’ anyone who has chided with mild disparagement the violence of extremists while hinting that the cause is right all the same.”

What corrodes a society even more deeply than violence itself is the acceptance of violence, the condoning of terror, the excusing of inhuman acts as misguided efforts to ac-

commodate the community's standards to those of the violent few.

When this happens, the community sacrifices more than its calm and more even than its safety. It loses its integrity and corrupts its soul.

Nowhere should the rule of reason be more respected, more jealously guarded, than in the halls of our great universities.

It is the rule of reason that is the most important.

Yet we all know that in some of the great universities small bands of destructionists have been allowed to impose their own rule of arbitrary force.

Because of this, we today face the greatest crisis in the history of American education.

In times past we have had crises in education. I remember them. We face shortages of class rooms, shortages of teachers, shortages that could always be made up, however, by appropriating more money.

These material shortages are nothing compared to the crisis of the spirit which rocks hundreds of campuses across the country today. And because of this, to put it bluntly, today higher education in America risks losing that essential support it has had since the beginning of this country—the support of the American people.

America, and Americans, from the time of our foundation, and particularly those that did not have the opportunity to go to a great college or university, has been proud of our enormous strides in higher education. They have supported it.

The number of students in college today has doubled in the past 10 years. But at a time when the quality of education is going dramatically up, its quality is massively threatened by assaults which terrorize faculty, students and university and college administrators alike.

It is time for the responsible university and college administrators, faculty and student leaders to stand up and be counted. We must remember only they can save higher education in America. It cannot be saved by Government.

If we turn only to Government to save it, then Government will move in and run the colleges and universities, and so the place to save it is here among those, the faculty, the Administrators, the student leaders. To attempt to blame Government for all the woes of the universities is rather the fashion these days. But, really, it is to seek an excuse, not a reason, for their troubles.

Listen to this: If the war were to end today, if the environment were cleaned up tomorrow morning, and all the other problems for which Government has the responsibility were solved tomorrow afternoon—the moral and spiritual crisis in the universities would still exist.

The destructive activists of our universities and colleges are a small minority. But their voices have been allowed—

My text at this point reads: The voices of the small minority have been allowed to drown out the responsible majority. That may be true in some places, but not at Kansas State.

As a result, there is a growing, dangerous attitude among millions of people that all youth are like those who appear night after night on the television screen shouting obscenities, making threats or engaging in destructive and illegal acts.

One of the greatest disservices that the disrupters have done in fact is precisely that, to reflect unfairly on those millions of students, like those in this room, who do go to college for an education, who do study, who do respect the rules, and who go on to make change and progress in this country.

But let us understand exactly where we are. I would not for one moment call for a dull, passive conformity on the part of our

university and college students, or an acceptance of the world as it is. The great strength of this nation is that our young people, the young people like those in this room, in generation after generation, give the nation new ideas, new directions, new energy.

I do not call for a conformity in which the young simply ape the old or in which we freeze the faults that we have. We must be honest enough to find what is right and to change what is wrong in America.

But at the same time we must take an uncompromising stand against those who reject the rules of civilized conduct and of respect for others—those who would destroy what is right in our society and whose actions would do nothing to right what is wrong.

Automatic conformity with the older generation—and I say this as one of the older generation—automatic conformity with the older generation is wrong. At the same time, it is just as wrong to fall into a slavish conformity with those who falsely claim to be the leaders of the new generation, out of fear that it would be unpopular—or considered square—not to follow their lead.

It would be a tragedy for the young generation simply to pursue the policies of the past, and it would be just as great a tragedy for the new generation to become simply parrots for the slogans of protest, uniformly chanting the same few phrases—and often with the same four letter words.

Let us take one example—one example that deeply troubles, and I understand why it does deeply trouble, many of our young people today: The war in Vietnam. We know the slogans. I have heard them often. Most of them simply say end the war.

There is no difference between Americans on that. All of us want to end the war. And we are ending this war.

Ending the war is not the issue. We have been in four wars in this century. We ended World War I. We ended World War II. We ended Korea. The great question is how we end a war and what kind of peace we achieve.

If it was a peace now that would encourage those who would engage in aggression and would thereby lead to a bigger and more terrible war later, it would be peace at too great a price.

As we look back over the 20th century, as we look at that whole record of this century, only 70 years, we in America have not yet in this whole century been able to enjoy even one full generation of peace.

So, the whole thrust, the whole purpose of this Administration's foreign policy—whether it is Vietnam, or the Middle East, or in Europe, or in our relations with the developing countries or with the Communist powers—is to meet our responsibilities in such a way that at last we can have what we have not had in this century: A full generation of peace. I believe we can have it.

That is why, in Vietnam, we are carrying out a policy that will end the war. It will do it in a way that will contribute to a just and a lasting peace in the Pacific, in Vietnam, and, we trust, also in the world.

There are those who say that this is the worst of times in which to live.

What self pitying nonsense that is.

I am perhaps more aware of the problems this nation has at home and abroad than most of you. But we in America, I say proudly today, have a great deal to be proud of—and a great deal to be hopeful about for the future.

Let us open our eyes. Let's look around us. We see, as we look at the whole sweep of history, that for the first time in the whole history of man, it is becoming possible here in America to do things that nobody even dreamed could be done, even 50 years ago.

We see a natural environment, true, that

has been damaged by careless misuses of technology. But we also see that that same technology gives us the ability, the ability to clean up that environment, to restore the clean air, the clean water, the open spaces, that are our rightful heritage. And I pledge we can do that and shall do it.

I know the fashionable line among some: Wouldn't it be great to live in a country that didn't have all these problems of material progress?

Not at all. I have been to them. I have seen them. And I simply would like to say to you that great as our problems are as a result of our material progress, we can do things, do things for ourselves and for others that need to be done, and we must see it in that way.

Look at our nation. We are rich, and sometimes that is condemned because wealth can sometimes be used improperly. But because of our wealth, it means that today we in America cannot just talk about, but can plan for a program in which everyone in this nation, willing and able to work, can earn a decent living, and so that we can care for those who are not able to do so on some basis.

We see a nation that now has the capacity to make enormous strides in these years just ahead, in health care, in education, in the creative use of our increasing time.

We see a nation poised to progress more in the next five years, in a material sense, than it did in the last 50 years.

We see that because of our wealth, because of our freedom, because of this much maligned system of ours, we can go on to develop those great qualities of the spirit that only decades ago were still buried by the weight of drudgery, and that in 75 percent of the world today are still buried by the weight of drudgery.

We see that we can do this in America, lift that weight of drudgery, allow the developments of the qualities of the spirit, and we can do it not just for an elite class, not just for the few, but for the many. All this can happen in America. The question is how shall we use this great opportunity? Shall we toss it away in mindless disruption and terror? Shall we let it wither away in despair? Or shall we prepare ourselves, as you are preparing yourselves, and shall we conduct ourselves in a way that we will be looked back upon as the beginning of the brightest chapter ever in the unfolding of the American dream.

Making its promise real requires an atmosphere of reason, of tolerance, and of common courtesy, with that basic regard for the rights and feelings of others that is the mark of any civilized society.

It requires that the members of the academic community rise firmly in defense of the free pursuit of truth—that they defend it as zealously today against threats from within as they have in the past defended it against threats from without.

It requires that the idealism of the young—and indeed, the idealism of all ages—be focused on what can be done within the framework of a free society, recognizing that its structures of rights and responsibilities is complex and fragile and as precious as freedom itself.

The true idealist pursues what his heart says is right in a way that his head says will work.

Idealism lies in the respect each shows for the rights of others. Despite all the difficulties, all divisions, all troubles that we have had, we can look to the future, I believe, with pride and with confidence. I speak here today on the campus of a great university, and I recall one of the great sons of Kansas, Dwight David Eisenhower. I recall the eloquent address he made at London's famous Guildhall immediately after victory in Europe.

On that day, the huge assemblage of all the leading dignitaries in Britain were there to honor him.

In his few remarks, one of the most eloquent speeches in the history of English eloquence, he said very simply, "I come from the heart of America."

Now, 25 years later, as I speak in the heart of America, I can truly say to you here today you are the heart of America—and the heart of America is strong. The heart of America is good. The heart of America is sound. It will give us—you will give us—the sound and responsible leadership that the great promise of America calls for—and in doing so, you will give my generation what it most fervently hopes for: The knowledge that your generation will see that promise of the American dream fulfilled.

SOVIET-NAZI PACT 31 YEARS OLD

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the August edition of ELTA, the Information Service of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, discusses in a very effective fashion the historic consequences of the shocking deal between Stalin and Hitler and the tragic fate that befell Lithuania and its two neighboring Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia.

SOVIET-NAZI PACT 31 YEARS OLD

Thirty-one years ago, in August, Stalin and Hitler empowered their foreign ministers to sign a treaty that had momentous consequences for Europe and the world. The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939 had two secret protocols attached to it which were discovered after World War II. By virtue of those protocols, the Soviets and the Nazis established their spheres of influence in Eastern Europe and divided the small countries therein between themselves.

A shock to some Westerners, the Stalin-Hitler agreement was in reality a most logical and practicable event. The two systems, while professing extreme differences, were alike in their basic totalitarianism. No peoples are better qualified to support this contention than the Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians who experienced both Soviet and Nazi rule. In 1968, the Czechs and the Slovaks asserted the same when they drew signs equating the hammer and sickle with the swastika.

With all the problems besetting the world today, some may say, is there any reason to keep remembering an event that is 31 years old? But the point is that many of the contemporary problems have their roots in the Soviet-Nazi deal of 1939. The Stalin-Hitler Pact paved the way for World War II and the present-day division of Europe. On the basis of this agreement, the present leaders of the Soviet Union continue to occupy the Baltic countries, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—and hold a number of East-Central European states under military and political domination.

Last year, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Soviet-Nazi deal, the legitimate spokesman of the silenced peoples of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania urged all the freedom-loving peoples and their governments "to recognize that the Soviet Union's position in Europe today is the result of its deals with Nazi Germany; that any negotiations which fail to challenge the Soviet annexation of entire nations would in fact keep Hitler's spirit alive and enshrine his deeds; and that Soviet imperialism—

the archenemy of democracy—is still at work as it was thirty years ago, to achieve its aim of world domination.

The appeal of the free Balts is as valid today as it was a year ago. With the Bonn-Moscow negotiations now in progress and with the European security conference a distinct possibility in the near future, the Stalin-Hitler Pact casts its shadow over diplomatic caucuses, the foreign ministries and negotiation tables. Any agreement today that would confirm, even if indirectly or partially, the Soviet ill-gotten gains would make its signatories into accessories of the Soviet-Nazi deal. Peace cannot be bought by concessions to dictators and by sacrifices of smaller nations.

"Level-minded negotiation with the Soviet government on serious matters," writes the noted historian Hugh Seton-Watson, "combined with measures to strengthen their confidence in each other's loyalty, can defeat Soviet pressures and maintain peace until the time when Chinese pressure on the Soviet Union is really dangerous. Then will come the time for concessions—not by the West but by the Soviet Union, not at the expense of people of Central Europe and of the Russian people, but to their advantage. Meanwhile, every defeatist statement by a Western politician, as well as every fatuous gesture of conviviality with Soviet officialdom, is a knife in the back of the courageous protesters in the USSR. . . ." And, we should add, of the people of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

COMMEMORATION OF 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF SUFFIELD, CONN.

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to revisit one of the most charming communities in New England, the town of Suffield, Conn.

On the occasion of my last visit, however, Suffield was not a drowsy little community. It was alive with activity as the residents of Suffield prepare to celebrate the community's 300th anniversary.

I know that my colleagues in Congress will join me in saluting Suffield and wishing the community continued prosperity and orderly growth.

Ironically, Suffield would not be a part of the State of Connecticut today if its early settler had not become disillusioned with our neighboring State of Massachusetts and sought permission of the colonial courts to become part of our Nutmeg State.

Suffield was established by John Pynchon who purchased 200 acres of land from the Indians and obtained a grant from Massachusetts. From its beginning, the fertile fields in the area have supported a flourishing tobacco industry.

Beautiful colonial homes that have been restored and kept in outstanding condition dominate the center of the community. Yet the community has progressed well in the 20th century and a \$1.5 million shopping mall will be opened on October 12, 1970, at ceremonies marking the official birthday of Suffield.

The residents of Suffield are planning a festive celebration to mark the community's 300 years. May their plans be successful and may their lovely community have the happiest of birthdays.

THE SST SHOULD BE BUILT

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the controversy which has surrounded the development of the U.S. supersonic transport plane has produced a wide range of arguments put forth by both sides. Too many of those who oppose the development of the SST, do so with seemingly little thought of the consequences if we do not complete this project. Their arguments tend to be based on "doubts" about America's technological and scientific ability to overcome the side-effect environmental problems that have accompanied new developments in almost every sphere of our modern world. They would rather quit now, and forego the great benefits to our economy and society, than to see the solutions to such problems produced—solutions that most certainly will also help us overcome other problems with which we are confronted as we attempt to cut down the noise and clean up the dirty air and water that pollutes our present environment.

One of the Members of this body who supports the continued development of the SST is the Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio. Recently he addressed the "Old Crows" chapter of Dayton, Ohio, on the SST question, and pointed out in clear and responsible terms why we must go ahead now. I should point out that the "Old Crows" membership is made up of a cross-section of the scientists and scientific technicians of the Nation's defense electronics industry—people not easily fooled by pseudo-scientific rhetoric that evades answering the basic questions the SST debate has raised. Mr. BROWN's remarks provide a depth of logic on this question that is so often missing in the arguments of the opponents of the SST program. So that my colleagues may benefit from what he said in addressing the "Old Crows" in Dayton, I include it in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN CLARENCE J. BROWN, OHIO, BEFORE THE DAYTON, OHIO, CHAPTER OF OLD CROWS, SEPTEMBER 10, 1970

If the Joint Economic Committee had been advising Queen Isabella, you and I would still be sitting in Barcelona wondering whether the world was round. Witness the Subcommittee on Economy in Government's recent report on federal transportation expenditure, wherein they recommended that we not fund development of the supersonic transport, the SST. Their majority report is a collection of unsubstantiated "concerns" and "fears". Reading it one has the growing sense that we've been here before, and you begin to look for the warning that we may fall off the corner of the earth.

Do not misunderstand me: reasonable men

may differ on whether an American SST should be developed at this time. But the disagreement should not be based on superficial, nice-sounding ideas; rather, it should be the result of practical analysis of hard facts. Playing the SST program with half-formed criticisms, is as intellectually progressive as it would have been if the first cavemen who saw fire had gathered around it and spit on it until it was extinguished.

I dissented from the report of the majority who opposed the SST. I believe the SST program should receive federal funding. Why? Because I think both the economic facts and the social concerns argue in favor of the development of an American supersonic transport.

The economic facts I speak of are these:

The United States alone will not make the decision as to whether or not there will be a supersonic transport. The British and French, with Concorde, and the Russians with the TU-144, are already test-flying these aircraft. The age of the supersonic transport is with us, whether the United States participates or not.

Another fact is that the airline industry sells time-savings: anyplace you want to go, they can get you there faster. Time is money. Any industry that is in the business of conserving time will take advantage of any technological change that proves to be economically valid—that will enable it to perform more productively. If supersonic aircraft prove technically and economically feasible, the industry will buy them. The question then becomes whose aircraft they will buy.

Presently, the U.S. aircraft industry supplies over 85% of all the commercial planes and parts in use throughout the free world. That position of leadership will disintegrate if other nations seize the technological momentum with a new family of supersonic aircraft. Accompanying this disintegration will be a significant change in our balance of payments (with an estimated loss of \$22 billion through 1990) and an equally potent blow to domestic employment—more on this later. That such a loss of a new market would adversely affect our ability to compete economically in markets for existing families of aircraft is axiomatic.

Opponents of the SST have used a balance of payments argument, too. They say that the SST will carry more U.S. tourists abroad where they will spend the U.S. dollars now burning holes in their pockets. Let's assume that supersonic travel will mean a significant increase in U.S. tourism. To argue that not building an American SST is going to prevent this is to ignore the existence of the Concorde and the Russian plane. Economically successful supersonic aircraft are going to be bought and used by the airlines, whether they are U.S. or foreign airlines and whether they are U.S. or foreign planes. Look at the 747s—look at the ads. If it is presumed that our balance of payments will be hurt by increased American travel, it is going to occur anyway, but that economic disadvantage might be ameliorated by retaining the present American aircraft leadership in world trade.

Others will argue that the SST is fine, but that it should be financed privately, that federal financing insults and weakens our free-enterprise system. While I share their reverence for the free-enterprise system their argument applied to the SST is, economically speaking, a sieve. It overlooks the fact that the SST will cost an estimated \$1.5 billion to develop, and that this figure approaches the entire net worth of our major commercial transport producers. No private financial arrangement can produce the kind of financing necessary to swing the SST.

We must realistically admit that the SST business is in fact competition between na-

tions. And we must not forget the sizeable boost the federal government gave free enterprise in the development of our railroads, our highway and waterway systems, and our atomic energy resources. The history of these ventures shows that government encouragement strengthened rather than weakened our economic structure. Federal assistance to SST development sets no new precedents.

As to the federal government's return on its investment, optimistic estimates of prospective sales of an American SST show a full return plus a modest rate of interest; and this does not take into account the social and technological benefits we may expect from improved employment, for instance, nor the possible salutary effects on our balance of payments. Even using the most pessimistic market estimates, it appears likely that the social, technological and economic benefits may offset the lack of direct cash return to federal coffers. In any case, the abandonment of the \$700 million already invested in the SST since it was proposed by President Kennedy promises no benefits. That down-payment is totally lost if we give up at this point.

It is one of the real political anachronisms of the present that several of my colleagues who oppose American efforts to develop a viable SST have been among the first to view with alarm the climb in unemployment in the U.S. aerospace industry. Some of them have even suggested the federal government should undertake employment in the public sector for those chronically unemployed in hard-hit industries. "Employment in the public sector" is a euphemism for the depression-born WPA. Retraining programs into careers where there is more demand for their talents have also been urged. If these two ideas fail, there is always the dole. But why not try to keep the highly skilled workers in the aerospace industry gainfully employed in something they do well—making aircraft? Developing an SST for a billion dollars that would give these workers a plane they can produce would at least give us an economic return on the expenditure of public funds for "social welfare" purposes.

And whether it is American workers or working men and women in Britain and France or Russia who develop and manufacture the supersonic aircraft, they will be contributing substantially—though in a way which defies measurement—to world understanding and, hopefully, world peace. Certainly reducing trans-Atlantic flying time to the equivalent of a flight from Dayton to Boston will have an impact on international trade relations between Europe and America. One could fly over in the morning, spend an afternoon making the sales, and return in the evening.

But our trade with Europe is already impressive. Think what it will do for our relationships with Africa, Latin America and Asia to cut travel time to one-third the present time. It could tie the world map together as closely as America has been tied together by developments in domestic aviation in the past 20 years.

That which motivates my colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee is not the economic reality, but rather, concerns about ecological possibilities. Given the current political impact of any threat of harm to our environment, all one needs to do is hint at ecological harm and politicians get nervous. They want action . . . or, as in this case, inaction, no matter how little is really known.

There is no question that we must become more jealous of maintaining and improving our environment; but it seems to me that a cleaner world can best be achieved by advancing technology, rather than retreating from it. If the SST presents a danger of a new ice age or of a fundamental alteration in weather patterns—claims which are unsubstantiated and often clearly contradictory—then would it not be best for America

to be involved in researching the possibilities? After all, the U.S. government, which presumably speaks for all of us, would surely deny final approval to anything that would be detrimental and would go into world councils to stop such a threat. But we can only go armed with facts not guesses.

One cannot help but ask how the U.S. would prevent the use of the Concorde outside American airspace should this British/French supersonic craft prove harmful to the world. Given our national concern for the environment, I feel strongly that America should undertake the development of the SST, if for no other reason than to assure the world a safe supersonic transport. No other country has our technical excellence, nor is any other country as responsive as ours to concerns of the people.

Noise—in itself a form of pollution—has been another major concern of the SST opponents. Yet competent testimony has indicated that the SST at its present state of development would be only slightly noisier at the airport sideline than the 707; and at this moment, the government and industry are in the midst of research aimed at reducing the noise level even more. In the more important area of community noise, the SST will be quieter than subsonic jets because of its faster climb capability and softer operation during landing approaches. And as to sonic booms, the President has already announced that the government will not permit supersonic flights over land if no way can be found to avoid the ear-splitting booms.

What I want to emphasize is this: we can no more let our concern for the environment stop technological development than we can let technological development destroy the environment. Instead of retreating from the technology which has given us so much, we should press on and use technology to restore and improve our environment. To take the opposite course and run from technical progress is to return to the cave.

Improving the quality of life is not a new quest. Mankind has always sought to do this. It is ironic that many of the things we complain of now as threatening the quality of life—the automobile and the airplane, for instance—were developed by our ancestors to improve transportation. But times change: we are now not only concerned with getting places rapidly, but also with breathing clean air while doing so. And we can have both through advancing our technology. Let us remember that while the air may have been fresher in the horse-and-buggy era, travel was a grueling test of endurance. And if it were not for progress in forms of mechanical transportation, Manhattan and the other congested areas would be facing a pollution crisis today from horse manure.

Governing is hard. The decisions are not easy. They become particularly troublesome when an issue requires fine line-drawing between economic facts and scientific development on the technological fringe. And when those fringe developments are tied up with ecology, it is a temptation to jump on the popular—if reactionary—bandwagon. It is always more comfortable to rely on the old familiar mustard plaster than to develop penicillin.

But as I said: Governing is hard; at least, governing responsibly is. The representative really earns his pay when, as he sometimes must, he resists the current emotional winds and goes in the direction his good sense points. And the medium which moves his common sense must be the unromantic, unemotional, objective stuff of the real world: facts, and not popular fantasies.

Using prudent judgment regarding our environment is an absolute necessity, but it is an area in which much is still unknown. Planning to meet our future transportation needs is also a complex task, but much more predictable. Consideration of future develop-

ments in our economy and assuring its stability and continued growth is likewise a vital concern. Abandoning the SST seems to me to be a disservice to all these concerns—and it is especially discouraging to think it could happen as the result of nothing more than political piousness around the currently high-flying banner of ecology.

THE COMPUTER COMMANDS THE CONSUMER TO "FORGET IT"

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 of this year I introduced two bills to relieve the consumer from corporate negligence in the use of the computer. Since that time, my office has been deluged with examples of indifference, carelessness, and incredible arrogance on the part of those who are supposed to run computers in large credit organizations. I reproduce below the complete text of a letter received from Sears by an understandably irate citizen:

We are in receipt of your letter inquiring about interest paid on this account.

This information is in the computer and will not be available until January 1971.

And, at the bottom of this letter, is a preprinted and rather gratuitous slogan:

Thank you for shopping at Sears.

Mr. Speaker, Sears is so grateful to this man for "shopping at Sears" that it could have forced him to delay filing IRS form 1040 ES for 3½ months. As he comments in a letter to me:

I wonder if this letter would be a bar to prosecution for failure to file and pay?

I am not prepared to comment on that legal issue, but I do believe that this absolute disregard of a legitimate customer request shows the necessity for the enacting of my bills, H.R. 16266 and 16267. There is an enormous legal lacuna surrounding the use of the computer which, as I have frequently pointed out, may inhibit the very real social and economic benefits which its proper application can provide our Nation. Certainly the Congress must begin to bring forth legislation which reflects the simple fact that business firms are misusing the wonders of computer technology. We must begin to find a process to bring responsible people from behind the data processing iron curtain. I urge my colleagues to join with me and support H.R. 16266 and H.R. 16267.

Mr. Speaker, the entire rationale of automated information systems is that they make it easier to assemble and reproduce specific data. I insert the letter as an example of the performance which so often follows that promise:

EAST BAY CREDIT CENTRAL,
September 11, 1970.

DEAR MR. —: We are in receipt of your letter inquiring about interest paid on this account.

This information is in the computer and will not be available until January 1971.

Sincerely,

A. ESCAMILLA,
Credit Department.

A MAN CALLED LEE

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Leland Sweeney, who has successfully served the County of Alameda as supervisor from its Third District, is retiring from public office.

Lee has served his city and his county wonderfully well and I can say that his many friends are reluctant to see him retire. They are reluctant to see him retire because of the great service he has rendered our city and our county.

It has been my privilege to know him and to have worked with him ever since he entered public life.

Lee is a former commander of the Alameda Post of the American Legion and has served as a leader on many community programs. I know, though he steps down now, that as the supervisor emeritus he will continue his interest in the welfare of the people of our fair community.

Everett Johannes, who is staff writer for the Alameda Times Star, wrote a front page story about Lee's retirement, titling it "A Man Called Lee." It is my privilege to insert it in the RECORD as part of these remarks.

"A MAN CALLED LEE": SWEENEY REVIEWS COLORFUL CAREER

(By Everett Johannes)

Call him "Needles" because he's always needing his fellow members of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors "to get 'em away from disagreements."

Or call him "Lee," because that's the affectionate way people have been addressing Leland Warren Sweeney for the 73 years since his birth in this city.

Or call him "Mr. Alameda," because Sweeney has earned that title as much as any man in Alameda's political history.

As he gets ready to retire from the post of Alameda's representative on the Board of Supervisors after 16 years of service, Sweeney yesterday reviewed his record from a comfortable chair in his living room at Southwood Drive.

As a public servant, he's responsible for creation of the Mayors Formula, which apportions funds from the sale of gasoline to the cities in the county for road work of major importance, and the Mayors Conference, which creates mutual understanding among Alameda County cities and has inspired similar organizations throughout the Nation.

Then, too Sweeney has these honors to his credit:

FULL TIME

He is the first supervisor who made the post a full-time job.

He instigated the Human Relations Commission to spur racial equality.

He championed the food stamp program in Alameda County to make "all iceboxes full iceboxes" in the county.

He appointed the first non-Caucasian person to a county commission.

He was responsible for moving Alameda's first aid facility to the Alameda Hospital, where there "are physicians instead of merely band aids."

He was as important as any man in getting Alameda a second Estuary tube.

And the brightest feather in his cap was his spearheading of a successful drive to in-

duce BART to erect its \$4½ million headquarters in Oakland—the "heart of the rapid transit district"—instead of San Francisco, which thought it had the big project "sewed up."

CONCERNS

Now, as he prepares to give up his office because he has reached mandatory retirement age, Sweeney sees three major concerns that will continue to occupy his successor.

"We've got to keep the courts in Alameda," he says.

"We've got to bring industry to Alameda, and we've got to get a new Fruitvale Bridge."

When Sweeney leaves his post Dec. 31, he will round out a political career that found him, instead of it being the other way around.

It happened this way:

In 1945, a group of Alameda civic leaders approached Sweeney and asked him to run for City Council.

"I told them I would on one condition," Sweeney said. "I said I wouldn't promise political favors."

And 25 years later, Sweeney is closing out his political career with the knowledge that he kept that condition the whole time he has been in political life.

He served more than 10 years on the Alameda City Council, including a term as mayor, before being elected to the Board of Supervisors, of which he was chairman in 1958.

The son of Michael Dennis Sweeney, early-day Alameda resident and Wells Fargo Bank cashier, Sweeney was born in the house at 2206 Encinal Ave.

"That's the house where Newt Elder, my fellow Democrat, lives now," Sweeney says.

He attended Porter and Alameda High School, where he was on the swimming team and belonged to the Kappa Alpha Pi Fraternity.

A University of California alumnus, he served as a Navy ensign in World War I. In the course of that service, he went to Mare Island Navy Yard and met, on a blind date, a pretty slip of a girl—Louise Burtle by name.

On that blind date, he kidded her that he came from Milpitas but later admitted his home was Alameda.

And Miss Burtle said, "Small world. I was born in Alameda. We lived on Buena Vista Avenue and Webster Street."

HANDSHAKE

They shook hands.

"And it was love at first shake," Sweeney recalls.

They were married in 1923, and are the parents of two sons, Bob, who operates a cleaning business in Castro Valley, and Leland, Jr., who manages the Northern California agency for Tab's, Inc., an IBM off-branch. The Sweeneys also have three granddaughters.

As a young man, Sweeney joined Crane Co., plumbing valve and fitting manufacturers, and worked his way up from a "lumper" of pipe to manager of the Alameda and Contra Costa Counties area.

After his term on the Board of Supervisors expires, Sweeney says he'll keep active.

"I have to do something. I'm a kind of fidgety guy. I've already had a few offers."

But it will be some job that lets Sweeney set his own hours, because he has been the victim of severe heart attacks which made it necessary for him to pass up a second term as chairman of the County Board of Supervisors.

He takes an avid interest in baseball—and he used to play golf, "but I couldn't shoot worth a damn."

IRISH EYES

His favorite song? You guessed it—"When Irish Eyes Are Smiling."

Sweeney and two predecessors—Harry Bartell and the late William J. Hamilton—share the record for tenures as Alameda supervisors.

Question: "Why did you enter politics?"

Sweeney: "I wanted to serve my fellow men."

And for proof, let it be noted that Sweeney gave up a \$1,130 monthly salary at Crane Company to go to work as full-time supervisor at \$600!

The men who follow in his steps will have some mighty big shoes to fill.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend our remarks in the RECORD in connection with H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 which passed the House on September 17, I would like to pay my respects to a Member of the House who, in my opinion, was extremely instrumental in making it possible for this legislation to be brought to the floor of the House for consideration. In fact, without his efficient, fair cooperation I doubt very much that a bill would have ever reached the floor.

I am referring to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the House Rules Committee; namely, the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER. When S. 355, passed by the Senate in the 90th Congress, was deferred in the Rules Committee, a number of discussions were held with Mr. COLMER as to the proper procedure to be followed in the future. Based thereon, Mr. COLMER appointed a five-man subcommittee of the House Rules Committee to study the overall situation.

During the extensive hearings and executive sessions Mr. COLMER was extremely cooperative and attentive. He knew at all times what action was being taken. When the committee agreed upon a final bill he was exceedingly patient and cooperative in connection with the hearings before the full Rules Committee, and although neither he nor I agreed with everything that was in the bill, he cooperated to the extent that he agreed to be the principal author of this measure. He followed all activities closely in the committee and on the floor of the House. His statesmanship at all times was outstanding.

I wish to express my thanks and deep appreciation to the distinguished gentleman for the effective activities which he has taken over these many months to make it possible for the House to pass this measure. It is indeed a distinctive milestone in his tremendous career. It has been some 24 years since a reorganization bill has been passed by the House of Representatives. It is even of greater significance in that rather than simply being a legislative act or a public law, the provisions so far as the House is concerned will change the House Rules.

Mr. COLMER deserves great credit and admiration for the judicially intelligent, fair manner in which he acted at all times in connection with this very important piece of legislation.

JUDGE HAYMOND HONORED

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's most distinguished jurists was honored recently by the American Bar Association and I would like at this time to add my congratulations.

He is the Honorable Frank C. Haymond of the West Virginia Supreme Court. Judge Haymond received a gold medal from the bar association in recognition of his career as judge and attorney.

At this time I include in the RECORD an editorial written by the editors of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette-Mail which appeared in the Fairmont Times. It aptly sums up the distinguished career of Judge Haymond who has brought so much richly deserved prestige and honor both to himself and West Virginia.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, Aug. 26, 1970]

JUDGE HAYMOND PRAISED

Oliver Wendell Holmes . . . Charles Evans Hughes . . . Tom C. Clark . . . Felix Frankfurter . . . and Frank C. Haymond.

The name of Judge Frank C. Haymond of the West Virginia Supreme Court was added to the list of distinguished men earlier this month at a meeting of the American Bar Assn. in St. Louis, Mo.

The association bestowed on Haymond its highest honor—a gold medal in recognition of his long career as a lawyer and judge.

It was a golden moment for Haymond as he received the medal from ABA President Bernard G. Segal.

Standing on a podium in the Chase-Parks Plaza Hotel, he addressed his remarks to these distinguished guests, among others:

Chief Justice Warren Burger, Associate Justice Potter Stewart, former Associate Justice Tom C. Clark, the Right Honorable Lord Justice, Sir Denys Buckley of England, and U.S. Solicitor Gen. Edwin N. Griswold.

"This is, indeed, the highlight, the epitome of my three score years, less two, as a member of the legal profession," the 83-year-old Haymond told the association members.

"As I do not possess the Biblical tongue of men and angels, I cannot truly tell you how I feel at this eventful moment."

He accepted the award "not solely as an individual recipient," but as a "representative of the members of their great bar association, who through the years, in many groups and in vast numbers have worked unceasingly to improve the administration of justice, which is the chief end of our American form of government."

He said he fully recognized the generosity and democratic action of the association in bestowing the award upon a "small town lawyer."

Haymond is the first West Virginian among 35 persons who have received the medal since presentation of the award was started in 1929.

All of the other recipients were from larger states. Most were from big cities, including New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Washington, Boston, St. Louis and San Francisco.

The first recipient, Prof. Samuel Williston, taught contract and sales to Haymond at Harvard Law School more than 50 years ago. (Williston lived to be 102 years old).

Among others were Reginald Heber Smith, Haymond's classmate at Harvard; Elihu Root, famous New York lawyer and one-time secretary of state; John Henry Wigmore, who wrote a classic treatise on evidence; and Herbert Harley, who founded the American Judicature Society.

A formal citation presented to Haymond said in part:

"Frank C. Haymond has continued with distinction a proud family judicial tradition fourth generation of judges in his family."

"He has been a judge for 31 years, 25 of them on the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, a record unequalled in this state. Six times his colleagues have chosen him president of that court . . .

"In recognition of a noble career of almost three score years spent in the service of his fellow man and in advancement of the rule of law, this association proudly presents to Frank C. Haymond the highest honor within its power to bestow, the American Bar Assn. Medal."

On the face of the large, heavy medal is molded the head and shoulders of Judge John Marshall, one of the very greatest American judges. These words from one of his opinions, are inscribed on the medal:

"To the end it may be a government of laws and not of men"

Last week Haymond took the medal out of a box on his desk. He admired the words and likeness of Marshall on the face of the medal and the goddess of Justice on the back. He said he didn't quite know yet just what he would do with the medal.

But he said he was inspired anew to continue the practice of his profession under this Socratic code:

"Listen patiently, consider soberly, answer wisely and decide impartially."

And, most important of all, Haymond said that he, the small town lawyer and 35th recipient of the award, was very proud to bring this high honor to small West Virginia, the 35th state.—*Charleston Gazette-Mail*.

MALI'S 10TH INDEPENDENCE DAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1970

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Mali celebrates its 10th anniversary of independence on September 22. On behalf of the Subcommittee on Africa I am pleased to extend to Lt. Moussa Traore, Chief of State and President of the Military Committee of National Liberation, and to the people of Mali congratulations and every best wish for the future.

Until 1960 Mali was part of the large colonial territory of French West Africa. Prior to the arrival of the French in the 1880's Mali had a long and interesting history. Historians will recall the grandeur of the ancient Kingdom of Mali, which reached its height in the 14th century with the conquest of the fabled city of Timbuktu. Today Mali is a progressive West African nation whose primary concern is national development, in which we have been privileged to assist. On November 19, 1968, the former regime of Modibo Keita was overthrown in a blood-

less coup led by the Military Committee of National Liberation. The Military Committee has announced its intention to return Mali to constitutional civilian rule as the pressing problems of national development are solved. We are confident of Mali's future and of the continued close friendship between our two countries.

NAUVOO IS RESTORED

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, all of us know of the trials of the Mormon pioneers who crossed America to settle Utah under the leadership of Brigham Young. But a fact little known about these industrious pioneers is their settling and building one of America's most beautiful cities in the mid-1800's—Nauvoo, Ill., on the banks of the Mississippi. A thriving city, Nauvoo was the largest city in the State of Illinois in the 1840's, twice the size of Chicago and three times as large as Springfield. After the murder of their prophet Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum at nearby Carthage, Ill., the Mormons decided to abandon the town and seek a new life in the West.

After 124 years the industrious Mormons have decided to restore Nauvoo "the beautiful" into what church leaders call "the Williamsburg of the West." I congratulate them for their efforts and wish them well in this endeavor.

A recent article in the New York Times explains this worthwhile project:

MORMONS RESTORE ILLINOIS VILLAGE

(By Seth S. King)

NAUVOO, ILL.—The Utah Mormons, who were driven from here 124 years ago, have come back. As a result, this western Illinois village of 1,000 people will never be the same again.

There is ample evidence that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is gaining momentum in its efforts to turn Nauvoo into what church leaders call "the Williamsburg of the West."

The non-Mormon merchants and civic leaders of Nauvoo watch all this with a mixture of approval at the thought of economic gains from visitors to the restoration and some apprehension that the Mormon plans, still not specifically outlined, will direct this potential bonanza into church-owned enterprises rather than local establishments.

40,000 VISITORS

At least 40,000 persons visited the restoration last year, and an increase of at least 10 per cent is expected by the end of this year.

Excavation of the foundations of the Nauvoo Temple, which was the largest building north of St. Louis and west of Cincinnati in the early eighteen-forties, has been completed and the site opened to visitors.

The houses occupied by Brigham Young, second president of the Mormon church; Wilford Woodruff, its fourth president, and Heber C. Kimball, a Mormon church and civic leader, have been restored and refurnished with period antiques.

The buildings that once housed the Mormon Church's printing office have been restored and partially refurnished.

The blacksmith shop of Chauncey G. Webb,

where many of the wagons that took the Mormons to Utah were built, has been reconstructed on its original foundation. Its two huge forges are now in operation and a Mormon blacksmith is making the iron fittings for the restored houses, working from originals found in excavating for the restoration.

AMPHITHEATER PLANNED

Last month, workmen broke ground for a 2,000-seat amphitheater on the hillside overlooking the spot from which Mormon wagon trains ferried the Mississippi into Iowa in the winter of 1846 on their painful journey west.

Nearby, exterior work on a contemporary styled information center and auditorium was nearing completion.

The Utah church has spent more than \$1-million in acquiring 1,000 acres, about half of all the property within the corporate limits of modern Nauvoo.

The restoration of Nauvoo, or as much of the towns as the church can purchase, is part of a Mormon program to re-create the setting of events that shaped the church as its center was moved westward from New York to Kirkland, Ohio, then to Independence, Mo., to Nauvoo, and finally, to Salt Lake.

PAINFUL MEMORIES

Nauvoo holds some painful memories for the Utah church, as well as the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, the branch of Mormonism formed when some followers of Joseph Smith split with Brigham Young, Smith's successor, and refused to follow him west.

In 1839, Smith found an appealing parcel of land in a sweeping crescent of the Mississippi opposite what is now Fort Madison, Iowa. He brought several hundred acres, chose a site on its highest point for a new temple, and called it Nauvoo, a Mormon version of a Hebrew word meaning "beautiful place."

Smith then brought many of his followers from Independence, where they had been under increasingly hostile pressure. They built a town of brick and log houses, created 37 business enterprises, and completed the temple. Within five years, Nauvoo had a population of nearly 15,000 and had become the largest city in Illinois, twice the size of Chicago and three times as large as Springfield.

TROUBLED COMMUNITY

But even before these five years had passed, trouble was again building up for the industrious Mormons. Quarrels developed with non-Mormons in the area and robberies and murders became frequent occurrences. In 1844, Smith and his brother, Hyrum, were killed in the jail at nearby Carthage, Ill., where, according to the Mormons, they had been taken on a trumped-up charge of treason against the State of Illinois.

By the winter of 1846, Brigham Young, who had rallied most of the Nauvoo Mormons around him, decided to abandon the town and seek a new life in the West.

Eight years ago, the Utah church formed Nauvoo Restoration, a nonprofit corporation, and began quietly buying the land and what was left of the houses once owned by the Nauvoo Mormons.

SEPARATE TOURS

The reorganized Mormons, who retained the property of Joseph Smith when the Mormons left, restored the Smith homestead in 1956 and the Mansion House, a later dwelling of the Smiths the next year. The branch of the church conducts its own tours through these houses, independent of the Utah church.

Within the next seven years, the Utah church expects to have restored most of the homes and shops that were in Nauvoo when the Mormons left. It also expects to staff these shops with Mormon craftsmen, in the Williamsburg pattern, and to recreate as much as possible the life of Nauvoo in 1846. Whether the temple, which was destroyed

by arson in 1848, two years after the Utah Mormons left, will be fully restored or part of it rebuilt has not been decided. But the corporation is planning to ring the original Mormon area with motels, a shopping center and a golf course.

POPULATION PREDICTION

"We expect that by 1980 the population of old and new Nauvoo will exceed 5,000," J. Byron Ravsten, resident manager of Nauvoo Restoration, said today.

Non-Mormon residents of Nauvoo, many of whom owned shops and lived here long before the corporation began its purchases, are well aware of the increasing volume of tourists.

But the older residents have bridled at earlier pronouncements by the Utah Mormons that the church's return to Nauvoo would rejuvenate a slumbering river village.

"We are well aware of Nauvoo's role in the history of the Mormons," said Elmer Kraus, owner of the Nauvoo Hotel and president of the Chamber of Commerce. "But after they left, Nauvoo had an interesting history of its own, including the reorganized Mormons, and we have managed to maintain a modest prosperity here since the Utah Mormons left."

COMMUNAL SETTLEMENT

Soon after the Mormons departed, the Icarians, a small French communal group, moved in and tried for seven years to maintain Nauvoo as a communal settlement.

After they failed, German Catholics began moving into Nauvoo, bringing grape vines with them and starting a modest wine industry that is still flourishing.

In 1874, Benedictine Catholics founded St. Mary's Academy, a resident high school for girls, which is now housed in a new building across the street from the old temple.

"There is definitely a big change around here already," Mr. Kraus said. "We know the village will never be like it was, but we think we'll all manage to live together, hopefully to everybody's advantage."

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, over the past year I have intervened in a number of school desegregation cases originating in my home State of Florida and at the request of the local school boards. On September 4, 1970, I participated in oral argument in one of those cases—Stancil Small, Jr. against the District School Board of Pinellas County, Fla. The decision in that case, upholding the validity of sections 401(a) and 401(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was handed down by the State court last week on September 14. For the light it will shed on our discussion here today, I submit the text of my oral argument at this point in the RECORD:

CIRCUIT COURT ARGUMENT IN PINELLAS CASE, SEPTEMBER 4, 1970

School segregation is dead—as a legal proposition; as a way of life.

We are not here today to discuss the pros and cons of segregation.

What we are here to consider is whether classification by race is a proper constitutional remedy for removing the inequities in education stemming from former racial clas-

sifications in the Pinellas County school system.

What guides are there to assist this Court in deciding this question.

First and foremost, there is the Constitution of the United States. Whatever we do must comply with its provisions.

Then, there are the expressions of the will of the American people acting through their National Legislature—the Congress of the United States. When the Congress has acted in conformance with duly conferred Constitutional authority, its mandate becomes the law of the land. And it remains such unless and until the Supreme Court of the United States specifically rules such an Act to be unconstitutional.

Third, there are applicable State laws.

And, last but not least, there are interpretations of all of the foregoing expressions of the people's will by courts of competent jurisdiction.

In my argument, I will focus on two of the foregoing—the Constitution of the United States and, the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I believe their commands are clear and controlling in the instant case.

At the time the Constitution was being discussed by the Founding Fathers, the institution of slavery was prevalent throughout the former colonies. How slaves were to be counted in the apportionment of representation in the Congress was one of the great issues of the Constitutional Convention. Indeed, it split over the question.

At no time were questions of Negro rights in any of their present ramifications considered by the Convention. The possibility of balancing of student populations in non-existent public schools certainly never occurred to the Founding Fathers.

Nor did balancing become an issue in the turbulent years that followed. Between the adoption of the National Charter and the Civil War the great issue was not the abolishment of slavery, rather its spread to theretofore free States and territories.

That's what the famous Dred Scott case, decided by the Taney Supreme Court, was all about. It, in effect, held that Negro slaves were chattels and, as such, enjoyed no fundamental rights even in Free States.

The War Between the States was fought not to free the slaves but to preserve the Union. Lincoln, for years, hesitated to issue the Emancipation Proclamation for fear that it would seriously jeopardize the Northern Cause. When he finally did, he limited its application to Confederate areas only.

So, up to that time, at least, the notion of balancing by races was never at issue.

Not until the post-Civil War period were the Dred Scott disabilities removed and not until ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were Constitutional protections for Negro citizens finally adopted. But, inasmuch as many of the States—North, South, and Border—which ratified these amendments maintained effective dual systems of laws for Blacks and Whites, the concept of racial balancing was never within their contemplation. Even in the South, which was then being reconstructed, the idea of balancing never reared its head. And, when Reconstruction was ended, Negro rights were proscribed again nationwide in laws, customs, mores, and tradition.

Such proscriptions were given judicial sanction in the famous Plessy case under the rationale of 'separate but equal'. And this doctrine remained the law of the land for the next half a century and more.

Where then did this proposition of classifying by race to remove racial classifications come from? Surely its genesis is not to be found in the Brown decisions. The Supreme Court in them simply stated that "separate

but equal" was inherently unequal, and had to be eliminated with all deliberate speed.

Ending discrimination in public accommodations and facilities, not compelling their integration, became the objective of Executive, Legislative, and Judicial action in the decade that followed. Insofar as education was concerned, the neighborhood school—equally accessible to Black and White children—remained the ideal.

But in 1963, a dramatic shift of aims and goals began. It was initiated by then-President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, in his Civil Rights Message to that Congress that year. Complaining of "the slowness of progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation", noting that it was more than 9 years since the Supreme Court's decision in the *Brown* case, he called upon the Congress to "assert its specific Constitutional authority to implement the 14th Amendment."

That authority of the Congress, and President Kennedy's clearcut recognition of it, is most important, for it underlines and controls almost everything that has happened since then.

To begin with, the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, one of the post-Civil War Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, provides in pertinent part: "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

In many cases, this declaration requires no further elaboration. For Negro citizens, it means that they are entitled to all the legal protections accorded their white peers.

But in other more complicated areas, it is not self-executing. The field of public education is such an area.

Aware that the Amendment would, in many cases, require elaboration and refinement to become effective, the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment provided in Section 5 that "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

It was upon this provision that President Kennedy relied when he sent his 1963 Civil Rights Message to the Congress. In it he urged that instead of merely limiting Federal action to desegregation, as had been done in the past, that the Congress should authorize a far broader program. He did so in these words:

"As previously recommended, technical and financial assistance would be given to those school districts in all parts of the country which, voluntarily or after result of litigation, are engaged in the process of meeting the educational problems flowing from desegregation or racial imbalance but which are in need of guidance, experienced help, or financial assistance in order to train their personnel for this changeover, cope with any difficulty and complete the job satisfactorily (including in such assistance, loans to a district where State or local funds have been withdrawn or withheld because of desegregation)."

Accompanying his Message was a legislative proposal designed to accomplish these ends. In those provisions applicable or public education, overcoming racial imbalance was an important feature as a reading of applicable provisions makes evident.

But the people's representatives in the National Legislature refused to accept the Kennedy approach. Wedded to the neighborhood school concept, and fearful that racial balancing would destroy this community building institution, they attempted not only to eliminate all vestiges of balancing from the bill, but in addition to specifically prohibit any actions by Federal courts or officials which might directly or indirectly sanction it.

After due deliberation in Subcommittee,

all reference to racial balancing was stricken from the bill. As set forth in additional views of several leading proponents in the report:

"The Committee failed to extend this assistance to problems frequently referred to as 'racial imbalance' as no adequate definition of the concept was put forward. The Committee also felt that this could lead to the forcible disruption of neighborhood patterns, might entail inordinate financial and human cost and create more friction than it could possibly resolve."

Still not satisfied, however, when the measure was considered on the Floor of the House of Representatives, Congressman Cramer submitted an amendment to section 401 (b) of Title IV which provided:

"Desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

Significantly the Cramer Amendment was unanimously adopted by the House.

Similar fears over racial balance were raised when the measure reached the Senate. To allay when, a further amendment was offered by the leadership consisting of Senators Dirksen (Minority Leader), Mansfield (Majority Leader), Kuchel (Minority Whip) and Humphrey (Majority Whip). Realizing that without assurances, H.R. 7152 would never receive Senate approval, they offered and the Senate approved a new proviso to Section 407 (a) which read as follows:

"Provided that nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards."

Senator Humphrey thereafter undertook to explain Title IV of the bipartisan substitute amendment. On the matter here at issue, he declared:

"Next, changes are made to resolve doubts that have been expressed about the impact of the bill on the problem of correcting alleged racial imbalance in public schools. The version enacted by the House was not intended to permit the Attorney General to bring suits to correct such a situation, and indeed, said as much in section 401 (b). However, to make this doubly clear, two amendments dealing with this matter are proposed."

"The first provides that nothing in title IV 'shall empower any "court" or "official" of the United States to issue "any order" seeking to achieve "a racial balancing" in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards.' This addition seeks simply to preclude an inference that the title confers new authority to deal with 'racial imbalance' in schools, and should serve to soothe fears that title IV might be read to empower the Federal Government to order the busing of children around a city in order to achieve a certain racial balance or mix in schools."

"Furthermore, a new section 410 would explicitly declare that 'nothing in this title shall prohibit classification and assignment for reasons other than race, color, religion, or national origin.'"

"Thus, classification along bona fide neighborhood school lines, or for any legitimate reason which local school boards might see fit to adopt, would not be affected by title IV, so long as such classification was bona fide. Furthermore, this amendment makes clear that the only Federal intervention in local schools will be for the purpose of preventing denial of equal protection of the laws."

Shortly thereafter a further colloquy took

place between Senators Humphrey and Byrd of West Virginia:

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Can the Senator from Minnesota assure the Senator from West Virginia that under title IV school children may not be bused from one end of the community to another end of the community at the taxpayers' expense to relieve so-called racial imbalance in the schools?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do. [T]he Constitution prohibits segregation, it does not require integration. The busing of children to achieve racial balance would be an act to effect the integration of schools. In fact, if the bill were to compel it, it would be a violation, because it would be handling the matter on the basis of race and we would be transporting children because of race. The bill does not attempt to integrate the schools, but it does attempt to eliminate segregation in the school systems. The natural factors such as density of population, and the distance that students would have to travel are considered legitimate means to determine the validity of a school district, if the school districts are not gerrymandered, and in effect deliberately segregated. The fact that there is a racial imbalance per se is not something which is unconstitutional."

Additionally, Senator Javits of New York, a staunch proponent of civil rights, was also heard from:

"Taking the case of the schools to which the Senator is referring, and the danger of envisaging the rule or regulation relating to racial imbalance, it is negated expressly in the bill. . . . Therefore there is no case in which the thrust of the statute under which the money would be given would be directed toward . . . bringing about a racial balance in the schools. If such a rule were adopted or promulgated by a bureaucrat, and approved by the President, the Senator's State would have an open and shut case under Section 603. That is why we have provided for judicial review. The Senator knows as a lawyer that we never stop anyone from suing, nor stop any Government official from making a fool of himself, or from trying to do something that he has no right to do. . . ." [emphasis ours].

Thus, it could not have been much clearer that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was not supposed to be used as a vehicle to impose racial balancing in public schools of the Nation—either North or South. Indeed, the exact opposite was intended.

Yet, almost before the ink was dry on this important legislation, Courts began to hold otherwise. The Jefferson case began the trend and others since have followed its lead in misreading or else disregarding the duly deliberated and solemnly enacted statutory directions of the Congress of the United States.

If the Constitution does not confer authority on the Courts to classify by race in order to remove racial classifications—

If an Act of Congress passed in accordance with section 5 of the 14th Amendment specifically prohibited such classifications—

Where then do lower Federal courts (and let's be clear on this, the United States Supreme Court has yet to rule on this question), where do lower Federal courts derive the authority to order busing and balancing as they are now doing?

It may be that Chief Justice Burger has supplied us with the answer. In a sharply worded dissent in a recent labor case, he declared:

"I am baffled as to why we should engage in 'legislating' via constitutional fiat . . . The Court's action today seems another manifestation of the now familiar constitutionalizing syndrome: once some presumed flaw is observed, the Court then eagerly accepts the invitation to find some constitutionally 'rooted' remedy. If no provision is explicit on the point, it is then seen as 'implicit' or commanded by the vague and nebulous concept of 'fairness' . . ."

The Constitutionalizing syndrome is clearly at work in the desegregation field. In support of judicial orders to accomplish what the Courts deem desirable ends, they have focused on 'presumed flaws' in neighborhood oriented desegregation plans. They have replaced them with what they pragmatically assert are plans implicitly commanded by the Constitution.

This vague and nebulous approach to the law is itself rooted in the doctrine the commentators call "the living Constitution". Under it, the Constitution and its Amendments need no longer be interpreted according to the language in which they were framed, the intent with which they were adopted, or the customs, practices, mores, and traditions in effect at the time of their ratification. Changing times, it is asserted, give rise to changing interpretations of the basic law of our land—even interpretations at odds with the framers' intentions.

Now it is certainly true that any judicial body must be accorded reasonable leeway in interpreting the law of the land in the cases that come before them. But, if the Constitution and statutes supporting it are to be worth the paper they are written on, the amendatory reach of the Courts must be limited.

There is, of course, always a temptation by well-meaning men, vested with judicial authority, to seek to impose their views of justice and right on an often, by their lights, misguided and uninformed people.

But by succumbing to such temptations, they inevitably impinge on the right of a free people to govern themselves. Such temptations must, therefore, be resisted.

All of us are concerned today by the mass disobedience by some segments of our population of laws which they profess are morally wrong, even though such laws were passed by duly elected representatives of the people. If we accord any legitimacy to the arguments of such groups, what then should our attitude be to legislation by judicial fiat? Is anyone morally bound by such edicts when they disagree with them?

To be a Government of laws not men, means to be a Government of due process—in the Executive, in the Legislative, and in the Judicial branches. To tip the balance between the branches of Government must inevitably lead to a disrespect and disregard of authority Constitutionally conferred on each. Ultimately, it must erode the foundations of all.

The Founding Fathers had their own ideas about making the Constitution a living instrument to govern a free people. They provided for an amending process under which fundamental law could be changed. In the absence of an amendment, Constitutional provisions were to be followed by the people's representatives in Congress, by the Executive and by the Judiciary, mindful of its proper role in the Constitutional scheme of things.

When this apportionment of Constitutional responsibilities is upset or ignored, the inevitable result is a crisis of confidence in all our institutions. Such a crisis is everywhere apparent today. It is nowhere more evident than in the field of desegregation.

In recent weeks, three prominent Americans—John Gardner, head of the Urban Coalition, Chancellor Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt, President Nixon's advisor on campus problems, and Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine—have spoken out on the crises confronting our country.

"All of them," according to Washington columnist, David Broder, "were saying the same thing: that America must rediscover its sense of community or fall victim to its internal divisions."

One of the strongest links of any citizen to his community is the neighborhood school system. Roy Innes, National Director of the

Congress of Racial Equality pointed this out in a recent interview when he declared:

Under the old system, the school and the church were the main two institutional structures in black communities that acted as stabilizers. It can be proven very easily that Southern black communities are more stable sociologically than Northern black communities, partly because the school—even that decrepit dual-school system—acted as a focus, a coordinator of social activities. That now is lost under the integrated system.

The social disorganization you see in the Northern black areas is because of the lack of a relationship to an institution. There is no relationship between blacks and their schools in the North.

If, as the Courts have repeatedly said, "the only school desegregation plan that meets constitutional standards is one that works", does it make sense to destroy neighborhood integration in order to achieve a forced and arbitrary form of racial integration which, wherever it has been tried has failed?

In the final analysis, the legal issues in this case, and in all desegregation cases involving racial balancing, come down to this:

Two wrongs don't make a right. Past discrimination in one direction neither justifies nor supports present discrimination in another. Just as the Equal Protection Clause does not require racial balancing in jury selection, it does not require it in school administration.

CONCLUSION

It is clear from a review of the evidence in this case that effecting a more favorable racial balance in the schools of the Largo area was uppermost in the minds of certain administrators of the Pinellas County School System.

In reflecting such views, those who would balance our schools by races are certainly sincere. But, so were the Members of the Congress of the United States when, acting in their wisdom and pursuant to their Constitutionally conferred authority, they prohibited balancing by races, religions, or national origins.

It is ironical in the extreme that their command should now be challenged by proponents of equal rights. At the time of its passage, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was hailed by proponents of equal rights as a charter for ending discrimination in this country by outlawing racial classifications for any purposes. It was believed that in this way, the dream of full equality for all Americans would soon be realized.

Unfortunately, the Act has not lived up to expectations.

Why?

Because its provisions have not always been followed.

Because frequently they have been confused.

Because all too often they have been deliberately ignored.

We, in this country, pride ourselves on the fact that we are a Government of laws, not men.

How long can we expect to survive as a free people if we recognize the notion that men, not laws, shall govern us.

I do not envy this Court its task. Its job is a difficult one. In rendering a decision, it will have to exercise—the wisdom of Solomon, the common sense of Washington, the vision of Jefferson, and the compassion of Lincoln.

Even then, some will argue that the result will not be meaningful or important. After all, they will say, this is but one small zone, in one county, in one State, in this vast land of ours.

At best, they will argue, it will constitute too small a step to really count for much.

But they are wrong!

As the old Chinese proverb says: "A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step."

CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE CHALLENGES PRESIDENT NIXON'S CRITICISM OF CONGRESS ON VETERANS LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record in support of remarks made this week by our colleague, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, in responding to President Nixon's recent criticism of Congress for alleged failure to enact legislation benefiting veterans of the war in Vietnam.

Congressman TEAGUE rightfully challenged the President's charge, and criticized him for injecting partisanship into veterans programs. I have conferred frequently with Congressman TEAGUE on legislation of interest to veterans, and there is no Member of this body with a better knowledge of the subject.

I think Congressman TEAGUE has done a great service to this Congress and to the Nation is exposing the hypocrisy of the President's accusations, and I would like at this time to have Congressman TEAGUE's statement printed in full in the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE CHARGES PRESIDENT'S CRITICISM OF CONGRESS ON VETERANS LEGISLATION MISLEADING

In a statement released today, the President chastised the Congress for not responding to his legislative recommendations and he produced a long list of proposals to back up his contention. He would have been well advised to have omitted reference to veterans programs. In view of the sorry record of the Administration on veterans legislation, the President certainly should have remained silent. The President's message contained the following statement:

"In the meantime—and for all time—America owes an obligation to the men who have fought in Vietnam, and not less to those who back them in the Armed Forces elsewhere. The Vietnam Veterans Assistance Act which I have proposed to the Congress would provide important new GI Bill benefits relating to post-secondary school training, the provision of Small Business Administration loans to veterans from minority groups, and the provision of guaranteed loans for the purchase of mobile homes. This legislation has not been enacted; it should be."

I am astounded by the hypocrisy of this statement. Such an attempt to infer that the Administration has been trying and the Congress has been obstructing attempts to improve benefits for Vietnam veterans is downright misleading.

This Congress has passed a series of very important bills aimed directly at improving benefits for veterans of the Vietnam War and veterans of other wars. The Administration has opposed practically all of this legislation. Early in the Congress work was begun on a series of improvements in the education and training program. Most important among these was a proposal to raise education allowances by about 35%. The Administration first attempted to have consideration of this legislation deferred, and later, upon seeing that Congress would not accept such a recommendation, tried to limit the increase to 10%. Even though President Nixon had been complaining that Vietnam veterans were not utilizing the education and training program, he called the rate increase pro-

posed by Congress excessive and inflationary and threatened a veto. Despite these attempts by the President to prevent improvement and expansion of the GI Bill and its education program, a bipartisan Congress passed this legislation virtually without dissent and placed the President in such a position that he could do nothing but sign it.

Vietnam veterans who are injured in service receive service-connected compensation. Congress enacted legislation this year over the protests of the Nixon Administration to grant an 8% cost-of-living increase to disabled veterans. The Nixon Administration attempted to obstruct this legislation and urged that it be deferred. Upon seeing that Congress was determined to deal equitably with the service-connected disabled veterans and see that their compensation kept pace with the cost-of-living increases, the Administration then resorted to another maneuver which had it been successful, would have cost the disabled veterans of this country \$100 million. The Administration recommended postponement of the effective date of the service-connected compensation legislation from July 1, 1970 to January 1, 1971. Congress rejected this maneuver and in a display of bipartisanship, passed the legislation, sending it to the White House with a July 1, 1970 effective date.

Earlier in the Session, the Nixon Administration attempted to block cost-of-living increases for widows and children of Vietnam servicemen who died from service-connected causes and other veterans whose deaths were service-connected. Congress took up consideration of this legislation early in the 91st Congress and passed it over the recommendation of the Nixon Administration that consideration of the legislation should be postponed pending "a study" being conducted by the Administration. Congress made adjustments in the compensation of surviving widows and children of veterans in line with cost-of-living changes and sent it to the White House despite the Administration's objections.

In an effort to realign the life insurance program covering veterans and other servicemen, Congress considered legislation to raise the amount of coverage from \$10,000 to \$15,000. It should be borne in mind that this is a group life insurance policy and the veterans pay the premium. Despite this, the Veterans Administration recommended against increasing insurance coverage for Vietnam servicemen exposed to combat hazards.

Before recent veterans conventions the Administrator of Veterans Affairs commended President Nixon for signing two veteran bills, when actually they were both opposed by the Administration. The bill which raised grants to paraplegics for specially adapted housing from \$10,000 to \$12,500 was opposed on the basis that any increase in the amount was not warranted, even though the amount was set many years ago.

The increase in the VA direct loan amount from \$17,500 to \$21,000 was opposed by the Administration and this opposition has continued. In its latest form, the Administration has recommended against extending the direct loan program to veterans for the purchase of mobile homes.

Congress has been greatly concerned with problems relating to the veterans hospital program, and has voted \$105 million in additional funds to solve some of the serious problems confronting the medical and hospital program. The bill bearing this appropriation was vetoed by the President.

The Administration opposition to veteran legislation has not been restricted to legislation involving Vietnam veterans. The Administration has also opposed legislation designed to benefit elderly veterans. While pushing a grandiose welfare scheme which would cost billions of dollars, the Adminis-

tration has opposed a bill designed to prevent elderly veterans receiving a pension from experiencing a loss in their pension as a result of the 15% social security rate increase voted by the Congress effective in April of this year. Despite the opposition of the Administration, Congress is proceeding with this legislation. Another bill aimed at solving problems of the elderly was the bill to permit any war veteran age 70 or over to enter a VA hospital without signing the oath of inability to pay, or the so-called "paupers oath." The Administration opposed this legislation.

President Nixon served in the House, in the Senate, and as Vice President prior to being elected President. His long service in the government has prepared him to understand thoroughly veterans programs. Yet, he has not chosen to accord these programs a high priority in his Administration. In view of the opposition of the Administration to almost every important piece of veterans legislation considered in the last two years, it is especially inappropriate and misleading for the President to infer that he has important legislative proposals pending before the Congress affecting the welfare of veterans which are not receiving attention. The bills which he mentioned specifically in his statement relating to amendments of the GI Bill were delayed until after Congress had completed its consideration of the new amendments to the GI Bill, and the proposals he is making are negligible. Congress actually started work on mobile home legislation before the President sent up his message recommending enactment of such legislation. Hearings have been held and this legislation is scheduled for report before the House Veterans Affairs Committee in the next few days.

It is an old political trick to blame your failures on someone else, and I suppose it is natural that the President should try to blame the Congress for the failures of his Administration, but he certainly should not refer to veterans programs unless he is prepared to answer for his long and consistent record of opposition and negativism.

Congress has always viewed veterans programs in a bipartisan way. There has been no partisanship in the Congress in the enactment of these many important programs during the last two years, and it is shame that the President would inject a note of partisanship when he has done so little for veterans.

TRAINING FOR LEADERSHIP

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, we who serve here are given the privilege of offering some advice to young people graduating from high school or college. Usually, we find it appropriate to refer in our remarks to the responsibilities of leadership which devolve on members of each oncoming generation.

In this connection, I found of interest the manner in which the special responsibilities of leadership were treated in a recent graduation address to a class of the Army Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Ga.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of this address by Maj. Gen. F. S. Greenleaf, deputy chief, National Guard Bureau, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MAJOR GENERAL GREENLEAF

Distinguished guests, parents and friends of the graduates and, most especially, fellow officer candidate graduates.

Today is a great day for you—great, because you have achieved a difficult goal. You have hacked a tough course. You kept going when quitting would have been so much easier.

Today is a great day for the National Guard and the Army Reserve—great because your graduation today increases the depth of our most precious resource—trained leadership. Your graduation adds 208 new officers, 139 to the National Guard of the United States and 69 to the United States Army Reserve. You young officers represent an immediate improvement in our readiness. Perhaps even more significant is the potential improvement which you represent. You are an infusion of new blood. An infusion that assures the continued growth of our capability to serve state and nation.

Of the two hundred million people in this nation, at least half—one hundred million—are under thirty. This is the group to which you belong—the youth of our country. We read and hear of the youth of our country as being dissenters, hippies, yuppies and anti-everything. Youth is sometimes categorized as being preoccupied with "pot," sex, and the destruction of what the men and women of my generation have built.

Nothing could be further from the truth. No generation has ever been healthier, more intelligent, better educated, more aware, and more concerned about the good of our nation, and its people, than your generation. You are probably even better looking than my generation.

Your parents and grandparents have achieved great things. They survived the worst depression in history. They probably knew hunger and despair. They stopped the German and Japanese juggernauts from taking over the world. They produced the Marshall Plan that put Europe back on its feet. They rid our country of many crippling and killing diseases. They have produced the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

At the same time, we have failed to free ourselves of racial hatred. We have failed to produce a world which can solve its international problems without the horror of war. We have left much for you to do. Your generation will be better prepared to solve those problems than any other generation. Opportunity for service is especially great for you as young officers. You have the opportunity to serve more fully because of your dual and concurrent roles as citizen and soldier. As military officers in your own communities you must make the military active in civic action programs. Programs which will see military equipment, facilities and expertise making direct contributions in solving civil and social problems.

You as officers of the Guard and Reserve have faced up to a difficult challenge. As officers, you will be expected to achieve the same professional educational standards as your active Army counterparts. Your units will be expected to maintain the same standards of performance as active Army units. True, it will take you longer but the standards are the same.

At the same time, you will support your families by productive work in civil life. You will be true producers in our economy. You will pay more in taxes than you will receive as military pay. Yet you have volunteered your free time in the service of state and nation.

Perhaps I sound a little carried away, so I'll close this train of thought by just telling you that I, as a representative of the United States Army and the National Guard of the United States, am terribly proud of you and grateful for your service.

A brief word about leadership. We will today confer on most of you the grade of 2nd Lieutenant. We cannot confirm you as leaders. Leadership is an art and as such is developed by experience and constant practice. The men you command will accept or reject you as leaders. If they accept you as leaders, your units will achieve great results and will do it with willingness. If they do not accept you as leaders, you can achieve some acceptable results as drivers. Let me assure you—you will be more effective and happier as leaders.

Gentlemen, I thank God for men such as you. We will expect much of you.

Congratulations, good luck and Godspeed.

IS "MORE" BETTER?

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as "free education." Education is very expensive, whether it is paid for through property taxes, income taxes, bond issues, tuition payments, or endowments. It costs a lot of money, whether the funds are provided by local, State, and Federal governments, or by students, parents, or philanthropists.

One of the best editorials on the subject of education that I have ever read appeared in the September 10 issue of the Citizen, a newspaper which is published in the congressional district which I represent. It is apparent that the writer knows more about the subject of education and its cost than do most of those who have been pontificating on the subject for decades and to whom altogether too much attention has been paid.

As I believe we ought to pay attention to some commonsense advice for a change, I am submitting the editorial, which is entitled "Is 'more' better?", for publication in the Record at this point:

IS "MORE" BETTER?

For far too long, the argument that "more is better" has held sway among government spenders at all levels as well as among their do-gooding, civil leader supporters.

A prime example, of course, is the public school. Of that elusive chimera, "quality education," which feeds almost exclusively on dollars, the educators told the gullible taxpayers, the more it consumed, the better the education would be afforded "our greatest natural resource," our young people.

The premise was questioned only when annual real estate tax bills grew from annoyances into economic disasters. Citizens began to ask themselves, and then the schoolmen, "Is the educational program offered today really better, in proportion to its cost, than that of 10 or 20 years ago, or is it just more expensive?"

The reaction set in swiftly, and the failure rate for tax increase referendums soared. Unhappily, the counter-move of many school boards was to refuse to believe what the public was telling them. Instead, they stoutly maintained that "more is better" and voted to borrow funds in order to support a curriculum to which all had become accustomed. (Habits, good or bad, are hard to break.)

At least at the local level, taxpayers can be and are stubborn. Repeated refusals to up the ante eventually penetrated the thickest of cranial ossifications, and costs in many districts were cut.

This meant that the seeds of further discontent, as we have observed in those school districts struck by the teaching staffs, were sown.

But painful as it is, the democratic process sooner or later grinds out a workable compromise—at least at the grassroots level. A major question is how distance between government and governed dilutes democracy's abilities.

A bigger bugbear than local school problems is federal (and to a lesser extent, state) spending and consequent taxation. After all, it is primarily the government of the United States, chiefly in the form of the Congress, that is responsible for creating the demon of inflation.

It is good to have such institutions as the Tax Foundation, which can cry out with the voice of conscience that the seductive blandishments of our representatives are largely false.

For example, don't most of us believe we are better off, financially, today than we were 10 years ago? The Foundation has had news for all of us: it found that Mr. Average, earning \$11,000 today, is no better off than he was in 1960, when he was making \$7,500. In 1960, total taxes took 23 per cent of his pay. Today that's 34 per cent. And, the rest of his salary increase has been devoured by price inflation. In 1960 terms, a dollar today is worth only 77 cents.

Mr. Average's taxes, the Foundation figures, have doubled in the past decade, from \$1,707 to \$3,475. Ten years ago, federal taxes took 11 per cent of his income; this year it'll be 14 per cent. Across the nation, state income taxes have risen in the same period by 161 percent; local taxes are up 108 per cent.

On the average, we spend 40 per cent more on government than we do on food. Doubtless we get more in government services today than we did a decade ago.

But is "more" better? Your congressman won't know how you feel unless you tell him. If you have and he won't mend his ways, there is the further remedy, the ballot box (well, voting machine). Failing that, the ultimate corrective, of course, is getting involved in politics yourself, or talking a reliable friend or neighbor into running. It's already happened at the grassroots: now it's time to move up the ladder.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 16, 1970, President Nixon delivered a major address on the campus of Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kans. The occasion marked the opening lecture of the university's Alfred M. Landon lecture series.

It was my privilege to join with the other Members of the Kansas congressional delegation, at the invitation of the President, to travel with him to Manhattan for the speech. Alf Landon, a distinguished Kansan, former Governor and former presidential nominee of the Republican Party, introduced the President.

I am sure I speak for all members of our delegation, and for all Kansans, in stating that we are proud that the President of the United States chose a great university in Kansas to make his important and outstanding address.

Yes, in an audience of more than 15,000 there were a few hecklers. But the enthusiastic reception which President Nixon received clearly demonstrated that the great majority of our young people are willing to listen. They want to be a part of the system and are working within it. It is reassuring to know that we have so many fine young citizens preparing for their responsibilities of leadership in our country.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the Hutchinson, Kans., News on the appropriateness of President Nixon honoring Alf Landon and Kansas, as well as a sampling of editorials from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital, Lyons, Kans., Daily News, and Chicago Tribune on his remarks and the events on the Kansas State campus.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News]

A FITTING TRIBUTE

The 83rd was a happy birthday for Alf M. Landon of Kansas.

He started four score and three just as he started many of the other 82—by donning his riding clothes and galloping along the Kaw.

He reaffirmed his faith in a government and a country he loves by telling an interviewer, "This still is a great nation, a great people. Government today is closer to an average man than it ever has been."

It should be added that men like Alf Landon have helped the average man's reach, and his political punch. He was a progressive governor and a progressive Republican candidate for President in 1936.

He is a Bull Moose who has tried to keep his party in the mainstream, but he has never abandoned it even when he thought it was going aground. At the same time, he has been quick to praise the loyal opposition when he thought it was right and that hasn't always left a good taste in the mouths of his Republican critics.

But even they recognize the icing was added to Landon's birthday cake when it was announced that President Nixon would kick off the Landon Lecture Series at Kansas State University this year. It is a high honor for Landon, the university and the state.

Perhaps President Nixon's direct recognition of Landon's contributions to the country will spur the Kansas Legislature to recognize his contributions to the state.

As has been noted before, a fitting tribute to a great Kansan would be to rename the State Office Building at Topeka the Landon Building. Democrats and Republicans alike then could take heart that the building stood for progress, at least in name.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle]

NIXON MESSAGE NOT NEW BUT WORTH REPEATING

There was little new in what President Nixon had to say to students and faculty members at Kansas State University, but his message can hardly be overemphasized.

That message was that America is afflicted with a "cancerous disease" that is spreading violence and terror as a political tactic. "The time has come for us to recognize that violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change," the President said.

There can hardly be any quarrel with that. Nixon is right when he says higher education in America risks losing the supporting of the American people because of campus disorder, and it is up to students and faculty

members to see that higher education does not collapse.

However, student dissent can't be marked off as simple agitation over the war in Vietnam, pollution of the environment and social injustice. Unrest is deep.

As Nixon pointed out, if the war were ended today, the environment cleaned up tomorrow and all other problems in the realm of government responsibility were solved, "the moral and spiritual crisis in the universities would still exist."

Not only is the President right, he may have underestimated the extent of student dissatisfaction.

But that is no reason to drag the administration's feet in taking care of such problems as can be solved by government. Ending the war and eliminating pollution might not pacify college students, but it would go a long way toward eliminating the stickiest problems, the ones which contribute the most toward unrest. And students would be less likely to fall prey to the professional agitators who foment so much of the violence students are blamed for.

The President can't solve the problem of student and faculty unrest by making a speech at Manhattan, Kan., but surely some contribution was made to bridging the communication gap.

The President made statements that should be made, and by and large, students and faculty extended the courtesy and respect due the President of the United States, or any speaker for that matter.

He didn't ask students for blind agreement, but suggested that the years ahead could be bright for America if there is an atmosphere of reason, of tolerance, of common courtesy—with the basic regard for the rights and feelings of others that is the mark of a civilized society.

In their hearts, most young people agree with this viewpoint. Some of them differ with others as to what America's future should be.

[From the Topeka Daily Capital]

COLLEGES SHAPE OWN FATE

President Nixon laid it on the line at Manhattan Wednesday when he denounced those who resort to violence and terror both in this country and abroad.

Speaking on the Kansas State University campus to a student-dominated audience, the President challenged college administrations and young people themselves to work within the framework of a free society to correct grievances.

Nixon minced no words in castigating dissenters who use criminal methods. As he strongly asserted, they deserve the contempt of every American who values the decencies of a free society.

While deploring all political violence, from hijacking of planes to ambushing policemen, the President placed special emphasis on campus disturbances. To do so to a university audience required fortitude.

To the credit of the K-State students, they frequently applauded the President's remarks and, at times, shouted and clapped down the scattered boos.

That the majority of the audience heartily endorsed his remarks was readily apparent to TV and radio listeners as well as those at Ahearn fieldhouse. Actually the few hecklers added emphasis to the points the President was putting across.

He pointed out that continued campus disturbances could result in loss of essential financial support by those disgusted by them—and he forthrightly called on college administrators, faculty and student leaders to save higher education in America.

As others have said before, he stressed that it is a minority who cause the trouble and oppose the responsible majority. To thwart

the trouble-makers, he emphasized that it is the duty of the academic community to rise in defense of the free pursuit of truth and defend their institutions from within as well as from without. The idealism of the young can well be utilized in performing this necessary task.

Nixon spoke for many of us when he asserted that only within the framework of a free society employing legal methods can the problems of the colleges be solved.

That the President should deliver his address in Kansas and in honor of Alf M. Landon is a tribute to the state and its people, for Nixon knows they are overwhelmingly in favor of a strong stand against anarchistic methods.

And the response given to the President's remarks, especially those which alluded to the promising future of the nation and its democratic system, was heartening to those who believe the U.S. can overcome its troubles and move forward to even greater accomplishments.

[From the Lyons (Kans.) Daily News]

HECKLERS NEATLY HANDLED

Paradoxical as it may seem, young hecklers—rude and vulgar—at the speech of President Nixon at Kansas university yesterday actually did a favor to the state and harm to their cause.

It is always difficult to decide what to do with hecklers. They can't be ignored, they won't listen to reason, and if force is used it simply draws more attention to them.

But the hecklers got their "come up-pance" from the 99.8 percent of the students who were on hand to politely listen to the President of the United States. The shouters ended up looking like fools, so overwhelmingly unpopular that they would be pitied if they weren't so arrogantly rude.

What happened was the interruptions of the President's speech actually ignited the indignity of the students and caused them increasingly throughout the speech to show the President—and the nationwide television audience—they had good manners, respected the position of the President, and were embarrassed by the few who had no manners at all. The applause of the crowd to the President's remarks grew as the heckling continued, reaching one high point when the President said there should be a willingness to listen to others without shouting them down.

Probably the standing ovation to that remark was what prompted the President to later ad lib that while his speech said that the minority has been allowed to drown out the responsible majority, "this may be true in some places, but not at Kansas State." The audience erupted with a yelling, cheering, lengthy standing ovation, which should have shown the President and the nation that the vast majority of students at Kansas State were a complete contrast to the handful of hecklers. And the irony is that without heckling there probably would not have been the tremendous show of politeness, good manners and respect.

The hecklers were shouting for the same old cause others have rudely expounded upon in the past, but the thought that came out of Kansas State is not what these people had to say, but how they were rebuked so tremendously by the others in the President's audience.—P.E.J.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

OUR CAMPUSES AND ENDS AND MEANS

At Kansas State University yesterday, President Nixon ably developed the major subject of ends and means. The topic is a classic perennial one on which it is impossible to say anything altogether novel. But it is a timely one—not only because the timeless is always timely, but also because university

campuses are currently undermined by a significant minority willing to use evil means.

Nixon's major thesis was: "Violence and terror have no place in a free society, whoever the perpetrators and whatever their purported cause. In a system that provides the means for peaceful change, no cause justifies violence in the name of change." Applying his thesis to the context of higher education, Nixon said, "It is time for responsible university and college administrators, faculty, and student leaders to stand up and be counted. Only they can save higher education in America."

This needs saying, nearly incredible though the need is. The incidence of murderous violence in campus communities has been increasing in recent months, and everyone looks forward with considerable anxiety to the school year now opening. The record all too clearly shows that the contemporary campus cutup is neither funny nor harmless, but deadly serious and ready to go to any lengths. The record shows, too, that university authorities have all too often been irresolute and compromising when they should have acted promptly and decisively. The President could have chosen no subject more appropriate to a major address on a university campus at this particular time than the one he developed at Kansas State.

The President's argument was all the more cogent for being eminently reasonable and fair. The high line he took yesterday sought no partisan advantage. He spoke as everyone's President, in terms that any good citizen, however critical he might be of some of the President's policies, can cheer and commend.

INTERNATIONAL CROSSROADS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, periodically, because of my great interest in volunteer efforts to build international understanding based upon moral principles, I have addressed the House and called attention to the magnificent contributions made by the "International Crossroads." This is an organization sponsored by the YMCA of Metropolitan Washington.

Their main activity is to sponsor Sunday morning breakfasts to which they invite all visitors to Washington, both foreign and domestic. All foreigners are guests of the club for breakfast, giving them an opportunity to meet with Americans and other foreign visitors. During that time, some person is selected to make a presentation on some aspect of religion and morality and the mutual world problems which would aid our better understanding of people, their cultures and philosophy.

All this, Mr. Speaker, is good will and will hasten the day when there is peace on earth and good will to all men.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in presenting the following statement on the 24th anniversary of the International Crossroads which was noted in May of 1970. It is my fond hope that all Members of the Congress will find time to read and ponder on the important lessons and experiences shared by some of the guest speakers who have addressed this won-

derful coming together on Sunday morning at the YMCA.

The statement follows:

INTERNATIONAL CROSSROADS: SUNDAY MORNING BREAKFAST, YMCA OF METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON—24TH ANNIVERSARY, MAY 1970

Twenty-four years ago an enterprising Washington attorney launched a most unusual goodwill program at the Central Branch YMCA. Its intent was to welcome visitors from foreign countries and from parts of the United States to the Nation's Capitol. The procedure was to be informal and friendly, the newcomers mingling with long-time Washington residents at a breakfast meeting. After the meal, highlighted by friendly table conversation, a noted speaker would be heard. Paul Brindle built far better than he had anticipated. On May 3 the International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast Club celebrated the start of its 25th year with a gala meeting in a brightly decorated setting. The gathering heard a stimulating speaker and witnessed the presentation of awards to those who had supported the venture through the years.

To open our 24th Anniversary Breakfast, Chairman L. Wilfred Fleury called on Mr. Paul L. Hershey, Executive Director of the Silver Spring YMCA, Silver Spring, Maryland, to give the invocation which was followed by the beautiful hymn, "Oh, Lord Most Holy, Oh, Lord Most Mighty" sung by Mr. Steven Lambert of France now with the Washington Friends of Opera, accompanied by Mrs. Barbara Anne Ruffin on the Organ. Guests attended from many lands, among them were, Italy, New Zealand, Ireland, Canada, India, Syria, France, Cuba, Egypt and Lebanon to mention a few.

Mr. Fred Carl, chief Executive of the Central Branch YMCA, reminded the large gathering that more than 21,000 visitors had attended these Sunday morning breakfasts since they were inaugurated the first Sunday in May 1946. They came from 134 countries. The friendships made at these informal breakfasts have been kept alive for nearly a quarter of a century by Brindle and other Chairmen. Mr. Carl then introduced several former speakers and honored friends of the breakfast club, among them were Dr. Jocelyn R. Gill, Chief Project Scientist, NASA, Mr. Charles R. Norberg, Chairman of the Mayors Committee on International Visitors, Mrs. Chase S. Osborn, widow of the late Governor of Michigan, Mr. William F. Willoughby, Religious Editor of the Washington Evening and Sunday Star, Mrs. Louise Sims, who has been with the breakfast since it started in 1946, Dr. John Maurer, President of Southeastern University. A man during the introduction then arose and identified himself as being from Brooklyn, N.Y. Another guest instantly asked the presiding officer, "Do you have an interpreter for the man from Brooklyn?"

We were honored to have Rep. John H. Buchanan from the great State of Alabama address us most inspiringly from his deep thinking and broad experience and who presented the Paul L. Brindle International Crossroads Breakfast Award of 1970 to the noted medical missionary and former Congressman from Minnesota, Dr. Walter H. Judd, a member of the Breakfast Club for many years. Some thoughts Rep. Buchanan brought to us on "Freedom" follow:

Representative Buchanan said he was privileged to be present once again and especially at the anniversary. From the 8th Chapter of John in the Bible, he quoted several verses:

Verse 31: "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed."

Verse 32: "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Verse 33: "They answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man; how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?"

Verse 34: "Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committed sin is the servant of sin."

Verse 35: "And the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the Son abideth ever."

Verse 36: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

Rep. Buchanan said that if every nation in the world were represented by a citizen, I am confident that it would be true that, that person would represent a people who long for freedom.

I believe with the founding Fathers of the Republic that man was created to be free—endowed with unalienable life, liberty and the happiness—intended by God and given to man. This Nation has sought freedom maybe mistakenly but consistently. Think of the Berlin Wall which many have climbed to escape for freedom.

In Tuscaloosa, Alabama, a person from Cuba who had left everything to come here, said, "I have forsaken everything for freedom!"

In 1954, the Korean Government and the United Nations released 22,000 prisoners of war—gave people the choice of where they would return. Some selected to go to Taiwan, 8,000 sought freedom in South Korea—seeking freedom among all else.

Looking everywhere, you will find within those hearts the longing for peace with justice.

One thing is clearly true—in the Soviet Union and China—at the grassroots burns this desire to live free and be as free men—the hope in all nations' people is that they can say, "Nobody can make me free, I'm free already."

In the Soviet Union, churches in Moscow are so restricted—only choir practice and worship services—no teaching—no colleges—no seminaries—no benevolence—no picnics—no training—no missionaries. If rules are violated, a person is subject to imprisonment. If he takes a stand, he can almost always lose job or schooling opportunities or be harassed and discriminated by Government atheists. In this country, it's a mark of respectability to worship. These brothers and sisters in Christ, give their witness under the worst circumstances, saying, "Thy will be done"—Thy will alone—No one can limit the freedom that is within God. That is so unique and precious to Christian people.

Freedom is challenged in this Nation. We are threatened by a force against human rights and self-determination. We have been threatened by totalitarian Godless repression—crime—student unrest—deep division over Asia—by sin and deprivation. This Nation is as strong as its people are pure, built upon the shoulders of people "who are the light of the world". Strength and purity keep us strong. We are free-born people—never a slave to any man. Yet, if you look around—at the signs—there are problems. If you are still a prisoner of sin, you are not free. Until set free from sin and self, you are not really free.

Is there freedom in "uprootedness"—hypocrisy, injustice—racial discrimination—hippie thinking (I'm going to let it go to pot) or Yippee thinking (I'll tear it up and burn it down). What kind of freedom is death and the kick?

A Nation is as a tree bringing up its fruit—rooted and grounded in love of God—attaching itself to the source of all life and all growth. We find the way to World Peace—to the Prince of Peace. Every individual should fall upon his knees, every head should be bowed, every tongue should declare that Jesus Christ shall come!

Mr. Fleury introduced Mrs. Loretta Pruett, President of the Ladies Committee by saying, "Every Captain has a Mate—this is Mrs. Pruett, a lady who is known the world over, but has never left her native country. She founded a 'Little UN' and an International Fellowship House. Now, here in Washington, D.C., at the YMCA where she is 'Mom', by all, she served as a Student Counselor and as President of the Ladies Committee of ICSMBC.

Mr. Brindle was then presented and presented Certificates of appreciation to Miss Ruby Cerder and Miss Grace Sweet for the generous support they have given the Breakfast Club.

Mr. Edward R. Place, President of the Washington chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, followed in the program, reading a letter from the White House from President Nixon sending best wishes to the Paul L. Brindle award winner and the Breakfast Club. A letter was also received from Congressman Fred Schwengel who is a member of the Breakfast Board of Trustees. It stated as follows, "the Paul L. Brindle Award was to be given to Dr. Walter H. Judd who has always been a scholar, and that Congress is better because Dr. Judd served there and all have been strengthened by his leadership." He explained that Dr. Judd "is a man that can truly be called a friend".

After Mr. Place read the two letters, he called on Rep. John Buchanan to present the Award.

Rep. Buchanan, in presenting the award, said that "many privileges come to a man in public life—opportunities to meet leaders in the world and in our Government." He told Dr. Judd it was his privilege to make this presentation to a man who was 10 years a missionary, 20 years of service in Congress, a champion of people in the world yearning for freedom, foremost in foreign policy and foreign affairs. Rep. Buchanan said he had the privilege of calling Dr. Judd his friend, that there was no one in the world like him; that the country has a reason to be glad that Dr. Judd is in it.

In accepting the award Dr. Judd stated, "I almost wished I dared to imagine I deserve this award!" He stated further, "Every time a door opens, I remember it would not have happened if I had not had what come before. In my ministry, I learned the most important thing was in a talk once given by Catholic Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen of Rochester, New York, 'we are right; they are wrong; and it does not matter whether we are right or wrong if we love each other and if we serve God who is the God of us all'. This Breakfast scene—for 24 years represents that—a chance to come to meet others and worship God". He added, "I will treasure this award while I keep on trying to do my best."

Following Dr. Judd, the Nations United Display was dedicated. General Bruce C. Clarke Vice Chairman, Freedom Foundation, Valley Forge, was called on to do the dedicating. He spoke of Mrs. George Smythe's (who was present) great husband when as a cadet caught the kick-off and compared it to what we're doing in Vietnam today. The cadet didn't stop and be tailed, he won the game. General Clarke spoke of the visitors from 134 countries and his pride at being among those who could be a part of this International Crossroads Breakfast. He said that he'd been privileged to visit 35 nations in the world. He commanded in battle the United Nations forces in Korea (15 countries represented). He said that, I have known a good many men, all colors, races, creeds, of many countries, I have found from that experience that I have always admired good men where ever I have known them in whatever country. He further stated that he

thought that was true—that, that was what we were trying to put through in our little organization. In August 1961, General Clarke told us, that President Kennedy ordered men to Berlin, an additional battle group. The air was charged with what could happen.

Would World War III start? The night before President Kennedy sat up most of the night. Along about midnight he sent for a military aide and said, "I was to know all about the Colonel who is going to take this group to Berlin". The person selected didn't go to West Point. He spoke German fluently—that was important. He went to Berlin. You had your dinner that night and relaxed. The crisis was over. General Clarke said that we don't care about background—we only welcome you as good people. We will have more for our display of flags and many other items. So all can know more about each country. This is the only world we have; those who went to the moon were anxious to get back—to the only place where there's life. General Clarke stated further, "I like to think of this earth as one World—that we will be living together for the benefit of all." He wished everybody was so dedicated, "for how good it would be to have the Whole World filled with Nations United."

In closing, The Rt. Rev. Mgr. Patrick J. Ryan (former Maj. General) gave the benediction.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION CRITICISM OF CONGRESS ON VETERANS UNJUSTIFIED

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the past 15 or more months I have become increasingly concerned about the apparent insensitivity of the Nixon administration about veterans affairs. In April of 1969, the administration attempted to reduce the medical care budget for veterans by \$17.5 million when every indicator pointed to the need for much more money to meet soaring workloads in VA hospitals and clinics and correct serious staffing and operating shortages throughout the 166 VA hospital system. The Congress restored the proposed cut in medical care and Congress added \$105 million to administration requests to care for America's sick and disabled veterans for fiscal years 1970 and 1971. These additional appropriations for medical care have been made over the protests of the VA Administrator who continues to insist that he does not need the money and could not use it if he had it.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1970, the President made a rather intemperate and uncalled for attack on the record of the 91st Congress. I, for one, believe this Congress has amassed a good record in enacting reasoned and meaningful legislation. I know this is the case in the field of veterans affairs. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has either opposed or recommended deferral or reduction in benefits of almost every piece of meaningful veterans legislation which has come before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the continuation of the bipartisanship of this

Congress on veterans matters which has enabled us to pass legislation—

Increasing compensation rates for disabled veterans and widows and children of deceased service-connected veterans;

To increase education and training allowances by 35 percent for Vietnam era veterans making this benefit meaningful to veterans heretofore discouraged by low rates from entering or continuing training;

To broaden and raise the amount of insurance coverage from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for Vietnam and other service-men exposed to combat hazards;

Increasing housing grants for paraplegic veterans from \$10,000 to \$12,500 which will greatly benefit many returning seriously disabled Vietnam veterans;

Increasing maximum loans under the direct loan program from \$17,500 to \$21,000; and

Preserving compensation rates for service-connected veterans who have maintained these evaluations for 20 or more years.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other bills which this body has also acted upon, many of which will soon be acted upon in the Senate, and sent to the President for signature. This fine record of the 91st Congress is one that we can be proud of—one that has been made despite the Nixon administration's action to either oppose, recommend reductions or delays in our actions. It is a sad fact, however, that even after criticizing Congress for not acting to help America's veterans, the Nixon administration is actively opposing legislation now being considered by the Congress to—

Protect over 2 million veterans and widows from having their pensions cut because of social security increases;

Provide home mortgage protection insurance for paraplegic veterans—many of whom are young seriously disabled Vietnam veterans;

Use national service life insurance trust funds—funds which belong to veterans who are participating in this plan—to provide hard to get housing financing for GI home loans; and

Permit any war veteran age 72 or over to enter a VA hospital without signing the oath of inability to pay—the so-called "pauper's oath."

Mr. Speaker, it is distressing and incredible that the President has chosen to criticize this Congress for not acting on the administration's so-called Vietnam Veterans Assistance Act. One of several of the provisions of this act pertains to mobile homes for veterans who are unable to otherwise purchase homes in today's inflated housing market. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that Congress began work on this subject long before the administration recommended it and a tremendous amount of congressional research has gone into writing a bill that will both protect the veteran, the Government, and responsible mobile home-builders from fly-by-night operations. This legislation has now been favorably reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and I predict it will be overwhelmingly passed by the House in the very near future. Our version of this

legislation contained a direct loan feature to enable direct Government financing in those areas where GI financing cannot otherwise be obtained from commercial lenders. This was left out of the administration proposal. Direct Government loans have been a part of both the World War II and the Korean GI housing bills and there is no reason that Vietnam veterans should not expect at least the same housing benefits as their predecessors in the armed services received.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep appreciation to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their outstanding support of the veterans legislative program which we have passed during the 91st Congress. We have had the utmost in cooperation from the minority members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and from the minority leadership of the House. In view of this fine record of bipartisan cooperation in the Congress, I am distressed that the President would seek partisan advantage, particularly when the administration has made such little contribution to the cause of veteran legislation. I insert at this point in the RECORD a statement I issued to the press on September 11, 1970, detailing these fine accomplishments:

TEAGUE CHARGES PRESIDENT'S CRITICISM OF CONGRESS ON VETERANS LEGISLATION MISLEADING

In a statement released today, the President chastised the Congress for not responding to his legislative recommendations and he produced a long list of proposals to back up his contention. He would have been well advised to have omitted reference to veterans programs. In view of the sorry record of the Administration on veterans legislation, the President certainly should have remained silent. The President's message contained the following statement:

"In the meantime—and for all time—America owes an obligation to the men who have fought in Vietnam, and not less to those who back them in the Armed Forces elsewhere. The Vietnam Veterans Assistance Act which I have proposed to the Congress would provide important new GI Bill benefits relating to post-secondary school training, the provision of Small Business Administration loans to veterans from minority groups, and the provision of guaranteed loans for the purchase of mobile homes. This legislation has not been enacted; it should be."

I am astounded by the hypocrisy of this statement. Such an attempt to infer that the Administration has been trying and the Congress has been obstructing attempts to improve benefits for Vietnam veterans is downright misleading.

This Congress has passed a series of very important bills aimed directly at improving benefits for veterans of the Vietnam War and veterans of other wars. The Administration has opposed practically all of this legislation. Early in the Congress work was begun on a series of improvements in the education and training program. Most important among these was a proposal to raise education allowances by about 35%. The Administration first attempted to have consideration of this legislation deferred, and later, upon seeing that Congress would not accept such a recommendation, tried to limit the increase to 10%. Even though President Nixon had been complaining that Vietnam veterans were not utilizing the education and training program, he called the rate increase proposed by Congress excessive and inflationary and threatened a veto. Despite these attempts by the President to prevent

improvement and expansion of the GI Bill and its education program, a bipartisan Congress passed this legislation virtually without dissent and placed the President in such a position that he could do nothing but sign it.

Vietnam veterans who are injured in service receive service-connected compensation. Congress enacted legislation this year over the protests of the Nixon Administration to grant an 8% cost-of-living increase to disabled veterans. The Nixon Administration attempted to obstruct this legislation and urged that it be deferred. Upon seeing that Congress was determined to deal equitably with the service-connected disabled veterans and see that their compensation kept pace with the cost-of-living increases, the Administration then resorted to another maneuver which had it been successful, would have cost the disabled veterans of this country \$100 million. The Administration recommended postponement of the effective date of the service-connected compensation legislation from July 1, 1970 to January 1, 1971. Congress rejected this maneuver and in a display of bipartisanship, passed the legislation, sending it to the White House with a July 1, 1970 effective date.

Earlier in the Session, the Nixon Administration attempted to block cost-of-living increases for widows and children of Vietnam servicemen who died from service-connected causes and other veterans whose deaths were service-connected. Congress took up consideration of this legislation early in the 91st Congress and passed it over the recommendation of the Nixon Administration that consideration of the legislation should be postponed pending "a study" being conducted by the Administration. Congress made adjustments in the compensation of surviving widows and children of veterans in line with cost-of-living changes and sent it to the White House despite the Administration's objections.

In an effort to realign the life insurance program covering veterans and other servicemen, Congress considered legislation to raise the amount of coverage from \$10,000 to \$15,000. It should be borne in mind that this is a group life insurance policy and the veterans pay the premium. Despite this, the Veterans' Administration recommended against increasing insurance coverage for Vietnam servicemen exposed to combat hazards.

Before recent veterans conventions the Administrator of Veterans Affairs commended President Nixon for signing two veteran bills, when actually they were both opposed by the Administration. The bill which raised grants to paraplegics for specially adapted housing from \$10,000 to \$12,000 was opposed on the basis that any increase in the amount was not warranted, even though the amount was set many years ago.

The increase in the VA direct loan amount from \$17,500 to \$21,000 was opposed by the Administration and this opposition has continued. In its latest form, the Administration has recommended against extending the direct loan program to veterans for the purchase of mobile homes.

Congress has been greatly concerned with problems relating to the veterans hospital program, and has voted \$105 million in additional funds to solve some of the serious problems confronting the medical and hospital program. The bill bearing this appropriation was vetoed by the President.

The Administration opposition to veteran legislation has not been restricted to legislation involving Vietnam veterans. The Administration has also opposed legislation designed to benefit elderly veterans. While pushing a grandiose welfare scheme which would cost billions of dollars, the Administration has opposed a bill designed to prevent veterans receiving a pension from experiencing a loss in their pension as a result of the

15% social security rate increase voted by the Congress effective in April of this year. Despite the opposition of the Administration, Congress is proceeding with this legislation. Another bill aimed at solving problems of the elderly was the bill to permit any war veteran age 72 or over to enter a VA hospital without signing the oath of inability to pay, or the so-called "paupers oath". The Administration opposed this legislation.

President Nixon served in the House, in the Senate, and as Vice President prior to being elected President. His long service in the government has prepared him to understand thoroughly veterans programs. Yet, he has not chosen to accord these programs a high priority in his Administration. In view of the opposition to the Administration to almost every important piece of veterans legislation considered in the last two years, it is especially inappropriate and misleading for the President to infer that he has important legislative proposals pending before the Congress affecting the welfare of veterans which are not receiving attention. The bills which he mentioned specifically in his statement relating to amendments of the GI Bill were delayed until after Congress had completed its consideration of the new amendments to the GI Bill, and the proposals he is making are negligible. Congress actually started work on mobile home legislation before the President sent up his message recommending enactment of such legislation before the President sent up his message recommending enactment of such legislation. Hearings have been held and this legislation is scheduled for report before the House Veterans Affairs Committee in the next few days.

It is an old political trick to blame your failures on someone else, and I suppose it is natural that the President should try to blame the Congress for the failures of his Administration; but he certainly should not refer to veterans programs unless he is prepared to answer for his long and consistent record of opposition and negativism.

Congress has always viewed veterans programs in a bipartisan way. There has been no partisanship in the Congress in the enactment of these many important programs during the last two years, and it is a shame that the President would inject a note of partisanship when he has done so little for veterans.

NIXON CERTAIN OF FUTURE PEACE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday and Thursday President Nixon visited Chicago and one of the items on his itinerary was a briefing provided to leading editors and publishers by the President and his foreign affairs specialist.

An excellent and most objective summation of the briefing was written by Lloyd Wendt, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Chicago Today, in that publication's Sunday, September 20 Focus section.

The summation follows:

NIXON CERTAIN OF FUTURE PEACE—OPTIMISTIC
IN CHICAGO BRIEFING

(Note.—The writer of this report on Nixon administration foreign policy has covered various areas of the war in Viet Nam, reported on Israel and Arab countries, and has written on politics and foreign affairs

for this newspaper from Germany and Russia. This analysis is based on experience in the field as well as briefings by top foreign affairs specialists in the Nixon administration.)

(By Lloyd Wendt)

The Nixon administration (foreign section) came to Chicago last week to give midwestern communicators a view of Nixon foreign policy, inside and long range. The vista was a heady and heartening one. If President Nixon and his advisors can bring it off, America and the world are destined to a happy and prosperous future.

The administration is optimistic despite the gloomy events and precarious situation in the Middle East. It is even more sanguine about Eastern Asia.

Is it possible that such an outlook can be justified?

Let's take a look at the administration foreign-policy position, as simplified and interpreted. This is what I get from briefings, limited against experience in the field. No secrets were disclosed, no new stances revealed. Administration spokesmen reviewed policy, forecast results up to 2000 A.D., and clashed with some of the skeptics, including me. But argument was about details of execution, not the long-range goals, and the goals seemed to me to be these:

The administration unquestionably wants world peace. Without it we cannot live in freedom long enough to solve our pressing domestic problems. If we try to solve the domestic problems first, as some urge, we may not last long enough to enjoy the benefits of the solution. For world communism and world anarchy continue to menace us.

Our No. 1 objective, in the view of the administration, is world peace. Our No. 1 concern should be whether we have the intelligence, character and stamina to follow the long road to enduring peace. If we fall the peace because we want to give total priority to domestic problems, we will doom to disaster our future and our children's future.

That's the long view.

The Nixon administration, as I understand it, is convinced that we will win the long-range peace and that we can do it by disengaging. Reason: the United States is no longer obligated to carry the burdens of the world. We can redistribute them if we don't try to do it too fast, and providing the U.S.S.R. and/or China do not force an abrupt and disastrous change of course.

The U.S.S.R. could be trying to force us from course right now in the Middle East. But the administration is inclined to believe that hope for that troubled area still is justified, despite the chaos in Jordan.

The administration feels that we can now be less expansionist in foreign policy because the United States position of pre-eminence, forced on us in World War II, has changed. Prior American administrations were forced to embark into wars, vast foreign give-aways, and to exert world leadership alone since the other major nations lacked power because of their devastation by World War II. The U.S.S.R., England, China, Japan, Germany and France were reduced to impotency by the war. In addition, the United States alone had a nuclear capability.

This situation led the United States into the Marshal plan, to save Europe; into Korea, to rescue Japan; into Viet Nam in an effort to rescue southeast Asia. And, by our combined Pacific activities, we sought to help save Indonesia and Malaysia.

These policies have largely succeeded, at great cost, except in southeast Asia.

In the late sixties, according to an administration view, changing world conditions changed the problem. The Johnson administration didn't recognize the change. Nixon did and defined the new Nixon policy.

In effect, the Nixon policy states that the United States no longer has to go it alone as No. 1. We are no longer No. 1 alone. The

U.S.S.R. has recovered and has atomic capability. A power balance has been achieved, and other nations helped by us, including former enemies, can and should share the world burdens.

So, instead of going into more world situations, the United States can pull out—providing we do it the right way and providing we make it clear we are not abandoning those nations which believe in law and order and self-determination of peoples.

The Nixon policy contemplates that other nations must be willing to fight all out for their rights and freedom before the United States accepts any responsibility for aiding them. This leads logically to Vietnamization in southeast Asia. Vietnamization makes it possible for United States forces to withdraw. However, if we withdraw at once, as some urge, Vietnamization would fail, and southeast Asia would be lost, for there is, indeed, a domino effect.

Can we, I asked, get all the way out of southeast Asia? Can we depend on South Viet Nam to form a stable government, with or without the North? Can Cambodia survive? Will Thailand fight if necessary [as Malaysia and Indonesia have done, successfully]?

The administration is optimistic. It believes South Viet Nam can defend itself.

There is some merit to this view, in my opinion. When I was in Viet Nam in 1965 the VC and North Vietnamese had almost split the country in two. Yet I saw elite South Viet Nam troops defeat crack NVA forces near Pleiku, and stop the split. Tho a small battle, it was a turning point in the war. Two years later I visited a Viet province held by South Koreans. They were doing a better job of "pacifying" the area—keeping it clear of VC and North Viets—than the U.S. Army and Marines in their areas. And the South Koreans had a tough area. A few years previously, during the Korean war, we didn't think much of the South Koreans as fighters. Now they are among the best. So it may be possible that the South Viets, who have fought well at times, can indeed stabilize their country and enable the United States forces to get all the way out in the next two years.

This appears to be the Nixon timetable, and it seems realistic.

At the same time we should recognize that it will not be possible, in the foreseeable future for us to get all the way out of Southeast Asia. We will need air bases in Thailand and we will need the 7th fleet or its equivalent.

We can share the foreign-policy burden, but we can't get rid of it, any more than you and I can get rid of the burden of law-enforcement taxes. If international communism and anarchy, or both spread, all free nations will suffer.

The administration problem in the Middle East is even more difficult and complex. While we probably can succeed in bringing the Viet Nam war to an end because neither Russia nor China, themselves rivals, will totally prevent it, this is not the situation in the Middle East. There we are facing a Russian problem.

The U.S.S.R. and the U.S. could stop the Israeli-Arab war fast if both agreed it should be done. This was proved when both agreed on the India-Pakistan war and ended it within hours.

But the U.S.S.R. evidently does not agree that there should be peace in the Middle East. It appears that some experts in the administration are puzzled at the U.S.S.R. reason for helping Egypt to violate the standstill cease-fire arranged by the United States. There is no question that Egypt, aided by U.S.S.R. technicians, did violate the cease fire. Why?

During the last few years, the U.S.S.R. has been building up forces in the Mediterranean. The U.S.S.R. also has taken advantage of U.S. friendship with Israel to gain

great influence in the Arab world. The United States has attempted to retain the friendship of some Arab powers while aiding Israel, with only partial success. One United States friend, Hussein, is now in big trouble.

It appears that the administration advisors believe that Russia will stop short of pushing a big war in the Middle East because there is such grave danger the United States will intervene and a world nuclear war will result. But Russia will meddle up to that point. Some advisors have pointed out that the United States is not treaty-bound to go to the defense of Israel. But, also, we have made clear that we do not intend to see Israel exterminated. We have made this especially clear to the Russians. So, the U.S.S.R. plays the dangerous game of keeping the war threat hot, but not too hot. Meantime, the administration appears to believe that the American peace effort can be salvaged. Evidently the administration has reasons for optimism it hasn't disclosed. But every American had better pray that the Middle East can be damped down before it is too late.

Possibly Russian fears of China may enable the United States to get a peace in both Asia and the Middle East and this may help explain optimism in Washington.

Russia recently concluded a treaty with Germany. This would have seemed impossible only a few years ago. The U.S.S.R. has a paranoic fear of West Germany, not without reason.

But, even greater, is the Russian fear of China. It's an ancient enmity. Karl Marx, the source of Soviet ideology, wrote back in mid-19th century that Russia and China must eventually go to war because they are the world's most implacable foes. Ironically, Marx didn't guess then that the potential enemies would both become Marxist.

But, despite his other mistakes, Marx was certainly right about U.S.S.R.-China hostility. The two nations have a long border like that between the United States and Canada, and it bristles with guns on both sides and more Russian divisions than the U.S.S.R. has in Europe. China charges much Siberian land was stolen from China.

It appears that the U.S.S.R. will not dare to get into a fight with the United States until it has solved the China problem—and that problem is getting tougher, not easier.

If Russia continues to be preoccupied with China, so preoccupied it can make a compact with hated and feared West Germany, then the United States gains some extra options.

Since our goal is peace, we have more freedom to move toward peaceful settlements in both Southeast Asia and in the Middle East. We can perhaps relax more in Europe.

So it appears that the Nixon policy, as loosely described here, has a good chance of working. Providing we have the patience, nerve and good sense to try the long range solutions. This requires united effort by our citizens. It needs a little time. And it demands endless vigilance, for no one is suggesting that the U.S.S.R. is growing soft or can be trusted. That idea was exploded once again in the Sinai desert just a few nights ago.

TOM ANDERSON SPEAKS—"SILENCE IS NOT GOLDEN, IT'S YELLOW"

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on September 4 and 5, the Citizens Councils of America held their 15th annual leadership conference in Atlanta, Ga. The meeting was well attended by represent-

atives of 32 States who spent 2 full days listening to speeches, lectures, and reports from outstanding pro-American leaders on the theme of "citizens power."

A high point in the program was an address by that inspirational American humorist, journalist, and evangelist, Tom Anderson. Mr. Anderson, editor of Farm and Ranch magazine, is internationally renowned for his column "Straight Talk." In his inimitable manner, Mr. Anderson proved himself to be the Patrick Henry of the hour and the Will Rogers of our decade.

His message, "Citizen Power Awakened," is so timely and inspirational to Americans who are dedicated to constitutional government and free enterprise under God, and because it is regarded as too controversial to be given any coverage by the great free press—it is too honest and straightforward for them to understand—I include the full text of Tom Anderson's great address to the Citizens Councils of America following my remarks:

ADDRESS OF TOM ANDERSON AT THE 15TH ANNUAL LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE OF THE CITIZENS COUNCILS OF AMERICA IN ATLANTA, GA., SEPTEMBER 5, 1970

This has been a tremendous convention. Every speaker has been superb. Some speakers hate to follow a great speaker. As for me, I hate to follow a poor speaker. Recently I followed a real poor speaker and all during my speech they kept booing him.

That introduction and reception makes me as happy as a Jew looking at pork prices in a meat market. And reminds me of the country boy from Georgia who went to the big city, got fabulously wealthy and "went society" in a big way. One night he was having a seated, black tie dinner for 16 when his little brother who he hadn't seen in 17 years blew in unexpectedly. A real hayseed. The only decent thing to do was to make a place for him at the table.

Little brother took a big swig of the soup, which was unbearably hot, and spit it out across the table. The stunned guests looked at each other in silence. Little brother grinned and said: "Some damn fools woulda swallowed that!"

First, I'd like to read to you an open letter I have written to the "silent majority":

"As you of the great silent majority may have heard, there are prophets of doom amongst us who are predicting civil war, dictatorship and disaster. Don't worry about a thing! The same thing happened to Rome and Rome recovered. A thousand years later.

If some of these fanatical alarmists had been in Rome the night Nero was doing his famous violin solo, they would have run amuck shouting fire! fire! Instead of listening to the beautiful music.

Why be a patriot when you can more easily be a non-person? As Alexander Pope said long ago: "A patriot is a fool in every age. Patriots are like sheep penned and milling, annoying the slumbering countryside with their bleatings." Why be smeared, reviled, bled and destroyed as a patriot when you can be neutral?

Whatever you do, don't join patriotic organizations! You "can do more good on the outside." Like the Woman's club where one member is designated to stay away from each meeting so she can give those attending something to talk about.

Let's learn to look on the light side! Like the Pavlovian mouse who was asked by his buddy, "How you getting along with Professor Pussey?"

"Great, I've got him trained. Everytime I ring the bell he brings me food." Be optimistic! Like the pollyanna who told his friend in the death house one hour before

his execution: "Cheer up! Just think, you still have your health!"

Remember, sixty-four percent of American wives and 50% of American husbands do not have sex outside marriage. Two or three of the best-read books in the past five years have not been pornographic. Only 700,000 young Americans in colleges and universities now accept the Communist condemnation of American capitalism and want to destroy the system, according to a survey by *Fortune* magazine. Only about half of the college student-body presidencies have been captured by the New Left.

Thirty-eight percent of girls graduating from college are virgins. Two-thirds of our 18-25 age group do not have any venereal disease. At the present rate of takeover, we will not become a communist dictatorship until about 1976. Seventy-eight percent of our colleges did not have riots last year. And 85% of the students and faculty members at riot-ridden colleges did not participate. Forty-one percent of our college students still believe in capitalism! Only 1/3 of last year's Princeton freshman class belonged to the anarchist, Marxist, anti-American students for a Democratic Society.

It is costing us taxpayers only \$67,000 a year to maintain Earl Warren in retirement! It's cheap at half the price!

There are probably fewer Marxists in our country than there are in Russia, and Russia is not even close to civil war. They don't even have riots. (They have firing squads.)

We kooks have upset the Communists so much that they might hasten the take-over, worried lest the American people wake up. They might even bomb us, since some experts say they will soon possess greater missile and anti-missile capabilities than we do. In other words, we saviors may be the death of you yet. Candidate Nixon campaigned on a "unity" program, which was as genuine as Teddy Kennedy's Chappaquiddick testimony. Teddy Kennedy—"Greater Love hath no man than this, That he laid down his friends for his life."

Lenin, too, talked about "the silent majority." He said: "The cultured classes of the capitalist countries of western Europe and America, i.e., the ruling classes, the financial aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the idealistic Democrats should be regarded as deaf-mutes and treated accordingly . . . they close their eyes to the above mentioned truth and so become blind, deaf and dumb. They will grant us credits, which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armaments industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers."

What will the dedicated "deaf mutes" do? Get on their knees and pray? The Communists have slaughtered millions of people, shooting them in the back of their necks while they were on their knees praying. I am not knocking prayer! I believe in it. But I wonder how Jesus rates prayer which comes only at the end of a gun barrel? I wonder how Jesus rates silence? Jesus told us to testify, to witness, to stand up and be counted.

Britain's Lord McCaulay forecast in 1857: "Your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th, with the difference that the Huns and vandals that ravaged the Roman Empire will have come from without and that your Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions."

And the N.C.C. and SIECUS weren't even born yet!

But don't worry about a thing! As President Johnson told you, "We never had it so good!" And as President Nixon says, "Let me just say this."

"Silent majority!" If you (pardon the expression) segregate those words and analyze them separately, you learn that "silence is the wisdom of the stupid"; and that the majority is usually wrong. And has been throughout history. Could the great silent majority be merely a great glob of slob? They had a "silent majority" in Germany in 1938. They have a "silent majority" in Russia now. Recently a German woman said: "We Christians in Germany often ask ourselves at what point we made our mistake (i.e., permitting the Nazis to enslave our country and most of Europe). We now say it was at the beginning. Never let any violation of human rights go unchallenged—not even one. After you have kept silent two or three times it is too late to speak out."

An old Hungarian poem puts it like this: "If you are among the brigands and you are silent, you are a brigand yourself."

As I have remarked before, brigands, when freedom is at stake, silence is not golden, it's yellow. When wrong is rampant in the land, silence is unchristian. When God is mocked on all sides, silence is sinful.

History, good and bad, has been made not by silent majorities, but by vociferous, dedicated minorities. Whether we win or lose this titanic struggle for freedom depends on whether the dedicated minority working for what is right and good is more powerful and more effective than the dedicated minority working for what is wrong and evil.

How did we get to the brink of disaster, revolution and dictatorship? The so-called "liberals," aided and abetted by the silent, stupid, yellow, short-sighted ignorant majority brought us here.

The silent majority is not really silent of course. It prattles constantly, about the weather, food, sex, which channel to watch and Jackie and Onassis.

Obviously, the latter diversion is a complete waste of time. Onassis is still dating his long-time mistress Maria Callas, and "America's favorite woman," Jackie, while dating Franklin D. Roosevelt and others (as she always has) is furious, as usual, because Onassis is back with Callas. It is rumored that Jackie is going to see a dermatologist. She wants to have a "callas" removed.

What can you do? Break silence! Get noisy. Get informed. Get involved. Get ready. Do the best you can, where you are, with what you've got. Work—in your church, school, political party. Join an effective pro-American, anti-Communist organization. And, instead of golf, take up another beneficial, invigorating and more relevant sport—target practice.

The term "silent majority" is far from new. It was used more than a century ago. It meant those who were dead. And, after a fashion, it still does. The silent majority won't save us from war, dictatorship and slavery! The silent majority has never saved any nation.

The silent majority sat by and saw Him crucified. The silent majority permitted the reign of terror in the French Revolution. The silent majority watched as the Christians were burned at the stake. The silent majority sneered when Patrick Henry pled: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" The silent majority watched as the street demonstrations in Germany were taken over by a little unknown paper-hanger and corporal named Adolf Hitler.

The silent majority is yellow, and always has been. History is determined by dedicated minorities. And even by inspired individuals. Only a few proclaimed: "He is our risen lord!" Only a few defended the bridge at Concord. Only a few signed the Declaration of Independence.

Enough dedicated ants can destroy an elephant.

"There's a clever young fellow named somebody else,

There's nothing that fellow can't do. He's busy from morning till late at night just substituting for you.

You're asked to do this, or asked to do that.

And what is your reply? Oh, why pick on me, get somebody else. He'll do it much better than I.

You've a worn-out excuse on the tip of your tongue.

Too busy, too something-or-other. When the truth of the matter is

You simply don't want to bother.

So much to do in this weary old world, So much, and the workers so few;

And somebody else is all tired and worn Just substituting for you.

'Tis time that this faithful old somebody else

Gets a much-needed vacation— Suppose you start substituting for him and Build up your own reputation."

You of the famed silent majority, when will you come down out of the grandstand and get into the game? When will you rebel? When it's too late? Thousands of American youth have trained in Cuba to become efficient revolutionaries who, when the time comes, can take over our country and your children.

What are you going to do, if in 1972 you hear a radio alert saying that a mob of 700,000 people are milling around the White House and will soon sack it? That the President and the Congress are virtual prisoners and have signed a bill "nationalizing" all essential means of production? That Congress later passed an "equal property act" making all citizens equal owners of all property? That United Nations forces have taken over to "restore order?"

What will you tell your children—if they're still alive?

Some head-buriers are still saying: "But protest is necessary and healthy! We are just going through a phase. It won't last."

They refuse to believe it. Like the drunk on the Titanic who said, as he heard the crunch: "I ordered ice—but this is ridiculous!"

Sincerely,

TOM ANDERSON.

We of the *unsilent* minority, we so-called "haters" and "aginners" are gathered here not because we hate, but because we love. We love God, honor, freedom, country. If we are to win, love, not hate must be our motivation, our fuel, and our goal.

Let's not be like the bar fly who fell asleep in his chair. Another drunk rubbed a piece of limburger cheese in his mustache. The limburger lad awoke, staggered up to the bartender and whispered:

"Ain't it awful!"

"Ain't what awful?"

"The whole world stinks!"

We do have many things to be thankful for. Like the driver who was overtaken by a motorcycle cop with siren screaming. "Stop! Stop!" he shouted. Your wife fell out of the car about a mile back!" Thank Heaven! The motorist answered. "I thought I had gone deaf!"

Typical Americans eat breakfast over their white tablecloths and pink newspapers, and end the day propped up before their boob tube which slyly undermines every form of religion, patriotism, decency, and self-reliance.

The world watches America, and America watches TV; America, former land of the free and home of the brave; now the land of the criminal and home of the scared; America, a land in which workers get paid for not working, preachers get paid for not believing, teachers get paid for anarchy, mothers get paid for not marrying, farmers get paid for not farming, and promoters get paid for fertilizer tanks which ain't; America, where the only God recognized in the

classroom is Santa Claus. A people who won't take a stand deserve to take a fall.

Even more appalling than the noise of the bad people is the silence of the "good people." Many "good people are mainly concerned with how to stay awake on a full stomach.

As General Van Horn Moseley said: "Those who have the most to lose will be the last to resist." (The country club set) and they're neither blind nor innocent; they are gutless and guilty.

/s Hiram Mann said: "No man escapes when freedom falls. The best men rot in filthy jails and those who cried, 'Appease, appease!' are hanged by those they tried to please." Appeasers are people who feed a crocodile hoping it'll eat them last.

It is fashionable to be a moderate, a middle-of-the-roader, these days. Many middle-of-the-roads are merely people who have no principles they'll stand up for. The middle of the road has been moving to the left for 25 years. Pontius Pilate was a middle-of-the-roader. He didn't dare make the decision to crucify Christ. He let the mob decide, the "democratic" thing to do. The middle of the road between good and evil is evil.

We conservatives are always accused of being against change—who have to be dragged into the 20th century—againers opposed to all change. But not changing just to be changing. Like the fellow who decided just for a change he'd start parting his hair crossways, ear to ear.

His one remaining friend asked, "Well, how do you like your hair parted that way?" He said, "Fine, except for one thing. People are always whispering into my nose." You can raise a pig in your parlor. It won't change the pig, only your parlor.

A government big enough to tell business who they must hire is big enough to tell workers where they must work. A government big enough to tell you who you must sell to is big enough to tell a buyer he can't buy.

This is all part of the grand design of the collectivist conspirators: one race, coffee-colored mongrel; one church, apostate and anti-Christ; one nation, not under God but under the beast—United Nations. The one-world do-gooders now proclaim that any kind of discrimination shows moral immaturity.

Reminds me of the man who sued his wife for a divorce because she was so immature. He said: why Judge, she'd even barge into the bathroom while I was in the tub and sink all my boats.

While all men are created equal in the eyes of God and the law, they don't long stay equal even there. God has his own "elect", penalizes unrepentant sinners, and the law penalizes repeating criminals.

A centralized welfare state brings slavery, not freedom. Property rights are the very basis of human rights. The right to self-determination of associates is the very essence of human dignity. Forced equality is not democracy but dictatorship. Free men are not equal and equal men are not free. The issue is freedom—freedom of choice. Freedom to choose the doctor who's going to have to wait to get paid.

A government which allows a "have-not" majority to confiscate the "excess" earnings and assets of the "have" minority is a governmental tyranny regardless of whether it has a constitution and free elections or not. For no dictatorship is more corrupt or tyrannical than the dictatorship of the mob. Even if there were no such thing as a Negro, "civil rights" bills are bills for the concentration of power, which the Bill of Rights specifically denies. "Open housing" and the busing edicts are additional planks in the dictator's boardwalk. Another nail in the coffin of states rights, another unconstitutional infringement of property rights, which is

the most basic and sacred of all human rights.

Nixon calls his trillion dollar city renewal plan a "human investment program" and Humphrey called his a "Marshall plan for the cities." Whether there's a dime's worth of difference between them or not, both are clearly unconstitutional.

President Nixon's hang-up is "unity." My dictionary says "unity" means: continuity without deviation or change (as in purpose or action); the quality or state of being made one."

And the lion and the lamb shall lie down together. Eldridge Cleaver and George Wallace.

Take from-the-haves-and-give-it-to-the-have-nots is Marxism.

"Guaranteed annual income is Marxism. The so-called 'civil rights' movement is Marxist-oriented." Abernathy: "Capitalism killed King."

Jesus didn't take the people out of the slums; He took the slums out of the people. Jesus did not minister to groups; he ministered to individuals.

No man can save our country from the top down. If we are saved from civil war, bankruptcy, and surrender we'll be saved the same way we were founded, from the bottom up, by we-the-people. But how do you save a country which doesn't want to be saved?

Since fiscal 1953, the beginning of the post-Korean war period, so-called "defense" expenditures are up 41% but domestic spending is up 242%. Since 1948, tax collections have increased \$109 billion a year, or 241%. Why? Population increases? No. During the past 20 years, population of the United States rose 37% and the cost of the federal government alone grew ten times faster than the rate of population.

"Defense" spending has increased 68% since 1960, but non-defense spending has increased 97%. Spending our way into prosperity is like . . . beer . . . drink 'til . . . even with the continued Vietnamization of our no-win war. The Federal Government will spend in this fiscal year more than 200 billion, and that's more, in one year, than 32 Presidents (from Washington through half of the third term of Franklin D. Roosevelt) spent in 153 years.

In socialist America today, one-fourth of the people are already living off the other three-fourths, completely or partially. In federalized America 48 million people now get regular government checks. That's roughly—and it is rough on those of us who pay the bills and don't get any—one out of every two households in America, assuming no duplications. That's even rough on the post office, having to deliver them. I dreamed awhile back that our collectivists had an answer for that too: that they plan to integrate carrier pigeons with woodpeckers, forming a pigeonpecker corps. The pigeonpeckers would not only be able to deliver the 48 million government checks, but they would knock on the door when they got there.

Government does not and cannot create great societies. Individuals create great societies, not vice versa. The only great societies in history have been free societies in which the individual had maximum rights and privileges and was the master, not the servant of government.

Total government planning has no room for true Christian charity. The best way to reduce the exploitation of man is to embrace Christianity. Christianity, not hand-outs, is the hope of the world.

Of course, we can't expect our leaders to be perfect.

Reminds me of the preacher who was preaching on the imperfections of man: "I, myself, am guilty of many sins of omission and commission. I dare say there's not one among you who even thinks he's perfect."

He was appalled when a little fellow timidly arose in the rear of the church and held up his hand.

"Sir, do you mean to say you think you're perfect?"

"Oh, no, Reverend! I'm just standing up in lieu of my wife's first husband!"

Our forefathers fought the revolutionary war in order to escape taxation without representation. Taxation without representation was not nearly as bad as taxation with representation as we have had in recent years. The collectivists who say "debt doesn't mean anything, we owe it to ourselves," and "the way to stop inflation is with a surtax," reminds me of the treasurer of the woman's club who got up and reported: "I am happy to state that through prudent management we ended the year with a deficit of \$114.23."

A little old lady in tennis shoes jumped up and said: "I move we donate it to the Salvation Army."

The collectivists brazenly proclaim that they will "take it from the haves and give it to the have-nots who need it so much." Hitler said the same thing, in German, and Lenin said it in Russian. That's not only unconstitutional. That's stealing.

Under Republicans and Democrats, our government, through abandonment of the gold standard, through confiscatory taxation, through continuous deficit spending, through government-sponsored union racketeering, through fantastic giveaways at home and abroad, through actual sponsorship of anarchy and insurrection across our land, through deliberate subsidization of the enemy—our leaders are destroying the home of the brave and the land of the free, deliberately. I am quoted the other day as saying "unwittingly." I didn't say "unwittingly" I said "deliberately." Our major menace is not the Big Red Army from without but the Big Pink Enemy within.

It didn't just happen—it was planned that way.

Our greatest menace is not fallout, but sellout.

The so-called liberals now talk about armageddon, the last war when all shall be destroyed. If we are on the brink of armageddon, who brought us there?

The "liberals" remind me of the boy who murdered his mother and father and then threw himself on the mercy of the court because he was an orphan.

With marxism taking the world, our leaders don't even mention the Communist menace but talk of "building bridges of friendship." No candidate for the presidency or vice presidency—except George Wallace and Ronald Reagan—even mentioned the Communist scourge. They play like it doesn't exist.

Of course, we conservatives want perfection. Like the old maid who had waited so long for the right man to come along. Her little nephew said: "Auntie waited so long for her ship to come in that her pier collapsed." Some people even condemn Ted Kennedy for wearing that neck brace to the Kopechne funeral. He needed it to hold his head up! Always remember this about Ted Kennedy. There's less to him than meets the eye.

We conservatives have our slight differences of opinion—like the bride-elect who said describing her differences with her fiancée, "I want a big church wedding," she said, "and he wants to break the engagement." Lots of good Americans have broken their engagement with both so-called major political parties.

Having to choose between Democrat and Republican puts us in the position of Adam: God showed Eve to Adam and said, "now, choose a wife!"

Switching from Democrat to Republican is like switching from CBS to NBC. Reminds me

of the time the Earl of Sandwich (who invented the sandwich) was challenged by back-bencher John Wilkes in the English parliament. Sandwich was kind of a ladies man, but he was tough in debate and told Wilkes that he was a no good so-and-so and that he'd surely die on the gallows or of a dread disease.

Wilkes replied: "That depends, my lord, on whether I embrace your principles or your mistress."

We who oppose tyranny, anarchy, despotism are now called kooks. Remember, during the 1964 presidential campaign, a group of psychiatrists "psychoanalyzed" Goldwater from "news" paper reports and prescribed by mail psychiatric help for him? I've never known a psychiatrist who didn't need psychiatric help. Which brings to mind the letter sent to a newspaper medical column: "Dear Doctor: Please send me the name of a good book on personal hygiene. I think I've got it." I think most psychiatrists have "got it."

Remember, *Today's Mighty Oak* is just yesterday's Little Nut which stood it's ground. And speaking of psychiatrists, I heard about a fellow who was having his last psychiatric visit after having spent years undergoing treatment. "Since this is our last session and I'm now cured," he told the psychiatrist, "Kiss Me Goodbye." "I'm sorry," replied the psychiatrist "I Can't Kiss You. We really shouldn't even be lying here on the couch together."

"Poverty" the liberals tell us, is one main reason for our "sick society." The so-called war on poverty is a blueprint for socialism and dictatorship, there is no unemployment in Russia. They shoot enough people to make the people and the jobs come out even. The U.N. charter says that all member nations should maintain full employment regardless of the consequences. It is impossible to have perpetual full employment and freedom. As important as the right to get rich, is the right to be a bum.

Of course, the only sensible way to really reduce poverty is to increase and improve private enterprise.

Some young people complain because there is no more opportunity. Somebody has estimated that 80% of the world's knowledge has been developed in the past 10 years and is doubling every 10 years. Ninety percent of all drugs being prescribed by physicians today were not even known 10 years ago. Ten years from now ¾ of all people who will work in industry will be producing products that have not yet been invented or discovered.

Where there is erosion of the national morality, property rights are always destroyed. Property rights are the foundation of morality. That's the reason one of the 10 commandments decrees: "Thou shalt not steal." The politician who will steal for you will also steal from you. Some of our politicians would steal a dead fly from a blind spider.

Well, we got rid of Johnson and got Nixon. Like getting a divorce and getting custody of your wife's parents. Some uninformed conservatives still think Nixon is a conservative—he's a weathervane.

Most of us don't yet know what to expect from President Nixon—which reminds me—

Once upon a time there were three bears: Papa bear, mama bear and baby bear. "Someone has eaten my porridge." Boomed papa bear in his deep sonorous voice. "Someone has eaten my porridge!" cried baby bear in her high little voice. Bitch, bitch, bitch! said mama bear. "I haven't even put it in the bowl yet!" Nixon-bear hasn't put our porridge into the bowl yet. But everything indicates it will be a better tasting, slower poison.

But isn't it nice to have a lady in the White House again? It is reported that Pat

Nixon has completed her redecoration of the White House. She has moved the barbecue pits back outside, the bathrooms inside, and swimming trunks poolside. President Johnson got rid of the Louis XIV bed in his bedroom because it was too small, and got a Louis XV.

The hippies, anarchists, Communists, and atheists are not trying to improve our government and culture: they are bent on destroying. They are the aginners.

An aginner whose mother-in-law died on a trip to Australia wired the undertaker: "Embalm, cremate, and bury! Take no chances!"

The productive capacity, the "materialism," inventiveness of the American system has long been the envy of the world. Our young people think they have invented everything, including sex. Actually, scientists say that kissing started because of the craving for salt. The caveman discovered that he could cool off by licking his neighbor's cheek. And then he found it was more fun if the neighbor was female. Then he forgot about salt.

They're (young people today) are as spoiled as a butcher's dog, most of them. They're always itchin' for money but never scratchin' for it.

I heard a while back about a widow who raised five wonderful boys all by herself. Somebody asked her "How in the world did you do that." The main thing she said was a pat on the back. You must do it early enough, often enough and low enough.

Where are the comrats making the greatest inroads? In some of the richest and most literate countries like the U.S.A., England, France and Italy. And with the "intelligentsia" and clergy throughout the world.

The answer lies not in "degrees" but in morality. And to this statement the typical leftist educator likes to parry with, "What is morality?" Many educators are dedicated to destroying morality. "Morality is what we think it is. What society says it is, a relative thing, they prattle."

Morality is not what some educator says it is: Morality is what the Bible says it is. Students being taught new "moral codes" don't need new codes but new teachers. Our Nation was founded by men who believed in God, in individual freedom, in high moral values and in personal responsibility. Whether we survive as free men or slaves depends not upon our education but upon our moral strength. Our problem is not our housing slums but our moral slums.

The hippies want to replace "dog eat dog" with "dog love dog." Both are animalism, and can only return civilization to the jungle.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said: "A man is what he thinks about all day long." On that basis to draw even a picture of a yippie brain would be obscene.

A psychiatrist friend of mine—I take that back—I don't have any psychiatrist friends—told me he sent a \$325 bill to a hippie patient: \$25 for listening and \$300 to clean the couch. One teen-ager I know spent 2 years trying to find himself—got a haircut & there he was. When my daughter was about 21, a lady told me that my daughter had more character than anybody she ever knew. This was the supreme compliment, next to being a born again Christian—and she's that too.

Character is the only thing of value we can earn on earth which we can take with us when we die. Reputation is what we're supposed to be. Character is what we are—when nobody but God is looking. Character knows no color, race or creed. Character is a victory, not a gift. To fail is not to be lacking in character, but to be lacking in character is to fail. The main purpose of a school, in my opinion, should be to build character.

The college diploma is the most over-rated

thing since Jackie Kennedy. America is a Nation of uneducated diploma worshippers. As any real Christian knows, a true Christian lives his religion, or at least tries to. And a truly educated person lives his education. You can tell how educated a person is by the way he spends his spare time. If it's in front of the tube, then he's a schooled boob, but not educated. The environment a person tries to create for himself indicates his character as well as his level of education.

Education is not a diploma. It is a way of life. An outlook. An upward reach which demands a growth of spirit.

Education belongs not to the state but to the parents.

Once upon a time three turtles went on a picnic—mama turtle, papa turtle and baby turtle. They arrived at the beautiful picnic grounds five years later. And then papa turtle discovered that he had forgotten to bring the can opener to open their cans of turtle soup. So papa sent baby turtle home to fetch the can opener.

Two years passed and baby turtle had not had time to get back. Papa turtle turned to mama turtle, stuck his neck out and said "I am very hungry. Let's eat just one sandwich each before baby turtle gets back."

"Ok," said mama turtle.

"Oh, no you don't!" screamed baby turtle as he stepped from behind a nearby tree.

"Just for that I ain't goin'!"

I'd like to add one small voice to the voice of the turtle: When it comes to goin' along with government schools, lots of us ain't ever goin'.

No matter how difficult the task or how long the odds, let us never quit trying. Like the fellow on the golf tee who said to his companion: "I've got to do well here! That's my mother-in-law on the club house porch."

"Don't be silly!" replied his friend. That's over 200 yards—you'll never hit her from here!"

Of course, there are many discouraging things. What hope is there for a nation which votes Jackie Kennedy as "most admired woman?" Except for the knowledge that for 10 or 15 years it was Eleanor Roosevelt.

The brainwashers' all-out effort to tell it like it ain't, reminds me of when one of the best marksmen in the country was passing through a small town and noticed numerous bull's eyes drawn everywhere, on fences, trees, walls. Every target had a bullet hole exactly in the center. "Who is this great marksman?" He asked. They took him to the town idiot.

"This is amazing marksmanship! I've never seen its equal!" enthused the marksman. "How in the world do you do it?"

"Easy as pie. I shoot first and then draw the circle."

People who see our day-by-day surrender and won't believe it are like the man who had become suspicious that his wife was being unfaithful to him. One night he returned unexpectedly from a trip and drove up in time to see a strange man approaching his front door. He parked his car and watched as the man was met by his wife and embraced warmly. He continued to watch while the man sat in the living room having highballs, engaged in intimate conversation. A little later he saw the man and his wife retire to the bedroom. His wife kissed the stranger tenderly and then walked to the window and lowered the shade. Then the lights went out. The husband sighed: "If I only knew for sure!"

This is a great crowd and all of the same mind—or nearly so. And few crowds are. Even at some funerals—like Eleanor Roosevelt's—some come to mourn and some to make sure.

Let us not mourn. Let's make sure!

President Nixon has told you super patriots that our diplomats are confronting the

Communists eyeball to eyeball. And after that? They kiss.

We lower mentalities must realize that the Senator from Oxford, J. William Fulbright, has said: "Fundamentally . . . the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war."

Few men of our time have dipped more deeply into the sacred fount of learning—and come up drier. Senator Fulbright makes me wish birth control could be made retro-active.

We may not win in our time—but some time the principles we are fighting for will win—because they are right. And if we merely sow the seeds for future generations, whether it be realized for our children or their children's children, we have only done our duty.

Some say our country has failed because its institutions have failed . . . because the Supreme Court, the President, the Church, the educational system, Congress and business have failed. Actually, we have failed because the people have failed. The Church hasn't failed. Christianity hasn't failed. It hasn't been tried. We the people just don't have enough of it.

A great actor was asked to entertain at a large dinner party one evening. A ripple of excitement ran through the crowd of prominent guests as he rose to speak. He chose to recite the 23rd Psalm, which he did eloquently. He finished the dramatic recitation in a thunder of applause, and the audience gave him a standing ovation.

The next speaker was an elderly white haired man, bowed and worn by long years of patient labor as a missionary. "I, too, would like to recite the shepherd's Psalm," he said quietly. Then, turning his face upward a little, and closing his eyes, he began . . . when he was through, there was not a sound. No word. No applause. And there was not a dry eye in the room.

Afterward, a man said to the great actor: "I don't understand. You both said the same thing. Your presentation was perfect in every way. Yet, when he spoke in his halting, imperfect manner, people were moved too deeply for words. What made the difference?"

"The answer is simple," replied the actor. "I know the Psalm: I know it well. But he knows the shepherd."

Many of say we know the shepherd, but few of us act like it.

Once upon a time a mighty king condemned one of his lowly subjects to die. The wretch proposed and the King agreed to call off the execution if, within a year, the condemned could teach the King's horse to fly. "Why postpone the inevitable?" a friend asked the wretch. "It's not inevitable," he replied. "The odds are four to one in my favor: 1) the King might die; 2) I might die; 3) the horse might die; 4) I might teach the horse to fly."

Jesus said, "all things are possible to him that believeth."

Bismarck said, "There seems to be some sort of special providence that looks after drunks, fools and the United States." True, God alone can save the world. But God won't save the world alone. Nor will prayer alone. God helps those who help themselves. The God-hating Communists have murdered millions of innocent people shooting them in the back of the neck while they were on their knees praying. Maybe one person can't save the world. But he can try.

In closing I would like to tell about a friend of mine named Paul who received a new automobile from his brother as a pre-Christmas present. On Christmas Eve when Paul came out of his office, a little street urchin was walking around his new car admiring it.

"Is this your car, Mister?" Paul nodded. "My brother gave it to me for Christmas."

"You mean your brother gave it to you and it didn't cost you nothing? Gosh, I wish . . ." He hesitated and Paul knew what he was going to wish. He was going to wish he had a brother like that. What the little boy said jarred him to his heels. "I wish" he said "I could be a brother like that."

Paul looked at him in astonishment and then impulsively asked "Would you like to ride in my new car?" "Yes, sir I'd love that." After a short ride he turned and asked "Mister, would you mind riding by my house?" Again Paul knew what he wanted. He wanted to show his family and friends that he could ride home in a new car. He was wrong again. "Will you stop right where those steps are?"

He got out and ran up the steps and a little while Paul heard him coming back—but he wasn't coming very fast. He was carrying his little polio crippled brother. He sat him down on one of the bottom steps and sorta nudged up against him and said: "There she is, Buddy, just like I told you upstairs. His brother gave it to him for Christmas and it didn't cost him nothing. Someday I'm going to give you one just like it. Then you can see for yourself all the pretty things I have been telling you about in the Christmas windows."

Paul got out and lifted the little cripple in the front seat and the shiny eyed older brother got in beside him. That began a memorable holiday ride. That Christmas Paul learned what Jesus really meant when he said "It is more blessed to give . . ."

POLITICS—A PROMISING FIELD FOR WOMEN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we all have among our acquaintances many able and talented women who would make excellent public officials. Women who have been active in groups such as the League of Women Voters, PTA's, and other education groups and neighborhood and community organizations have a fine background and potential for elective office. Let us hope that the growing interest in the role of women in our society means more women will look to politics as a promising field and that they will receive the support they deserve.

The editors of the Minneapolis Tribune on September 7, 1970, published an editorial on this subject. It is worth reprinting in the RECORD:

POLITICS—A PROMISING FIELD FOR WOMEN

The number of women in politics is phenomenally low, considering the lack of legal barriers and the push for greater opportunities for women. The score nationally is: one woman in the Senate and 10 in the House, with perhaps another five likely to get in this fall; about 300 in state legislatures, 31 in other state elective offices, and 14 as mayors of cities over 10,000.

Why don't more women run for public office? Politics is tough, competitive, tiring and often difficult to combine with family life and husbands' jobs. Many voters still assume it's a man's field, though a recent Gallup poll reported that 83 percent would support a qualified woman for Congress. Party leaders usually assume that male candidates are more likely to win, and women normally take second place in obtaining campaign funds.

But women traditionally have done well in lesser public positions in their own communities—on school boards, library and park boards, for example, and in appointive positions on state boards and advisory committees. The Minnesota Legislature, which we believe would benefit from more women members, had only two in the last session, but 13 candidates are running now. Two women council members in Minneapolis and one Hennepin County Board member have shown that women in such positions can contribute responsibly and intelligently to local government.

Politics should be one of the natural routes in the movement for greater "equality" between the sexes. More women should try it. We all would benefit.

J. IRWIN MILLER: A HOOSIER PROFILE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following study of Mr. J. Irwin Miller, of Columbus, Ind., which appeared in the September 13 edition of the Indianapolis Star magazine.

The author, Mr. Lloyd B. Walton, points out Mr. Miller's far-ranging interests, including service on two President's Commissions, and as head of the World Council of Churches. One of Mr. Miller's primary concerns, however, has always been the improvement of his home community—Columbus. It has been largely through his guidance that the architectural and cultural improvements have come to fruition which have earned the community's reputation as the "Athens of the Prairie."

The article, which is a history of one Indiana family's rise to prominence and of Mr. Miller's dedication to the family's tradition of service to its community, State, and Nation, reads as follows:

HOOSIERS IN PROFILE: J. IRWIN MILLER

(By Lloyd B. Walton)

An Indianapolis speaker noted for his wit traveled to Columbus, Ind., to address a dinner group a couple of years ago. He trotted out his best comic lines, only to have them fall as flat as U.S. 31.

After the debacle, he apologized to the program chairman, explaining that he had dug to the bottom of his repertoire and that lines which always had been sure-fire missed. He was mortified.

"Think nothing of it," replied the program chairman. "J. Irwin Miller was in the audience. And if he doesn't laugh, nobody laughs."

In truth, although J. Irwin Miller personally has conservatively 75 million (all dollars) reasons to be jolly, he is a man of stern appearance, brief in his speech, frugal in his emotion. His Columbus office is as austere as the man, presumably to preserve its Victorian decor. He has solemnly poured thousands of dollars, uncounted hours and limitless "push" into Columbus art, architecture and culture to help justify the "Athens of the Prairie" sign outside town. He says his bank will continue to do so.

His image of spending money to do worthwhile things without being frivolous prompted Esquire magazine in 1967 to offer

Miller as their own non-nonsense Republican candidate for President. In Columbus nobody publicly laughed at that, either, and the impression around town is that while there may be a few sour-grape critics for the sake of sour-grapes, there are few citizens who genuinely resent the Miller umbrella.

It's not surprising that such a man is not easy to get to know in a few hours—and even that time is a luxury in the schedule of a man whose corporate interests span the world.

Lean and hard, as you would expect him to be (6-foot-2 and 190 pounds), J. Irwin Miller greets visitors across a well-organized desk in his office at 3d and Washington Streets, across from the Bartholomew County courthouse. At 61, Miller looks at least 10 years younger.

The few papers on the desk top are a day's work—it will be completely clear when he leaves in the afternoon. That's his secret of accomplishment, do everything right now and don't allow anything to pile up.

Behind him a heavily-laden modern bookshelf looks slightly out-of-place in contrast to the 19th Century windows towering high above them. A soft, striped rug and black leather upholstered chairs invite you to feel at home—but the sweeping second hand on a little desk clock cautions against getting too comfortable and wasting any of the moments that are dollars to the gray-haired man behind horn-rimmed glasses.

One end of the row of books is supported by a brilliantly colored ceramic elephant Miller's wife brought him from India. Books range from technical treatises and management manuals to financial theory and Cummins annual reports. A Bible is prominent on the shelf.

Miller is attired in a conservatively-tailored blue suit, striped shirt with button-down collar and a blue silk tie embellished with miniature Yale bulldogs (he was graduated from Yale in 1931)—the tie was a gift from his wife.

When he's not commuting to Cummins facilities throughout the U.S. or Europe—and he travels to some of them every week—Miller is behind that desk every morning shortly after 8, following a hurry-up breakfast at 7:30. He dashes from his modern home on the outskirts of Columbus in a 4-year-old Jaguar.

But no matter where the week has him traveling, Miller plans to be in Columbus to spend the weekend with his family and attend First Christian Church. His workday (in the office) ends promptly at 5 p.m., and the family enjoys frequent musical get-togethers, with one of the kids on piano and dad on the violin.

His rigorous schedule helps keep him trim, but Miller admits he occasionally has to "exercise" by pushing himself away from the table to hold his weight steady. He likes all kinds of food, never smokes and takes only an occasional social drink—no preference—“Whatever the host is serving,” he says.

“I try to play a little golf every week. But I'm afraid I never do any other sort of exercise.”

Untold thousands of words have been written describing the history of the Irwin family and Cummins Engine Company. But Miller is reticent to glorify the family's activities. He can, and does, boil the past century into a few terse paragraphs.

“My great-grandfather, Joseph Irwin, came to Columbus in 1845 or 50,” Miller says, “He had a dry goods store on this same site.”

As Irwin had the largest safe in town, farmers asked him to keep their money for them. Irwin took advantage of a good public relations opportunity and did this as a service—with no charge to the customers. It was a good gimmick and business flourished. Then some of the farmers asked him to start

handling all their money affairs and Irwin became a private banker.

“He built the original bank building here in 1860,” says Miller. “But it was half dry goods and half bank.” The present building followed—and the bank has been in business and growing ever since.

Several years ago an ultra-modern bank building was erected, and the old structure remodeled into offices.

“Great-grandfather, along with his son, William Irwin, and the Donners of Columbus, chipped in together and started a tin-plate mill at Anderson,” he says. “Then in 1900 they started the first electric interurban line from Indianapolis to Louisville and sold it in 1912.”

“They bought the old starch works at Edinburgh and started Union Starch and Refining Company. It has plants at Edinburgh, East St. Louis, South America and the Philippines. We sold it recently to Miles Laboratories at Elkhart.”

“Clessie Cummins and uncle Will Irwin started Cummins Engine Company in 1919,” he says.

Then he quickly fills in the highlights of his own years with Cummins—started as general manager in 1934, went to Navy in 1942 for two years (he was a lieutenant), Cummins retired in 1959 and Miller became president. He rose to board chairman in 1951. Cummins died in 1968 in California, having sold his interest in the company.

Life wasn't always so rushed for the lanky industrialist. There was a time when he could get together with friends and practice the music he loves so much. Miller's violin playing is strictly a hobby but a serious one—he prefers Bach and renders it on a Stradivarius.

“A long time ago, when I didn't travel so much, I played with a group of friends,” he says. “We had a string quartet for about a year or so.”

Miller's “thumbnail history” leaves out details such as that he is a director of American Telephone and Telegraph, Equitable Life Assurance and Chemical Bank New York Trust Company, that he is a trustee of Yale University, the Ford Foundation and of Christian Theological Seminary.

The real J. Irwin Miller comes to life as you talk with townspeople and associates. It's almost as if you are talking about three people, so active is he in business, church, civic and national affairs.

Miller had what some kids would consider a dull childhood life—but one which was ideal preparation for his adult role. He and his sister, Clementine (now Mrs. Robert S. Tangeman of New York City), learned to be quiet unless they were spoken to or could raise a question that would interest the highly-educated elders of the family. The old Irwin mansion on Fifth Street was a scene of intellectual conversations on every conceivable subject.

Miller's maternal grandfather, Zachary Taylor Sweeney, was a onetime U.S. consul in Istanbul and was the town's leading minister. Grandmother was a determined exponent of Christian social doctrine. Aunt Elsie (who still lives near Columbus, at Harrison Lakes) was a spinster who wrote religious research papers and researched deeply into music. Great-uncle Will G. Irwin was one of the state's richest men and became a Republican national committeeman. His father, Hugh Thomas Irwin, had been a professor of history and languages at Butler University. He later was elected lieutenant-governor of Indiana.

It was a fertile atmosphere for growth in religion, politics, culture and business. And the lessons sank deeply.

As a child Miller had a stuttering problem, few chums, and showed no talent for leadership. His favorite time of year was the an-

nual family summer vacation on Canada's Lake Rosseau, north of Toronto. This became such a pleasant interlude that he still takes his wife and children there in the summertime.

It was at Oxford where he was on the rowing team that Miller gained more confidence in himself and got rid of his stammering. And there's been little time since then to even think of the past—the present is too well filled building for the future.

In 1933, fresh home from Oxford University with a master's degree, Miller jumped into the business world by going to work at Purity Stores, a chain of more than 100 supermarkets in California—nearly half-owned by his family. After nine months there he was called back to Columbus to take over as general manager of the Cummins plant.

Clessie Cummins had developed a new fuel pump and injector system that made Will Irwin think the diesel engine could be successfully used in trucks. But truck manufacturers wouldn't go for it. So, Uncle Will had Purity Stores pull the gasoline engines out of its entire fleet and installed Cummins diesels. Results were so fantastic—and economical—that it seemed obvious steady and economical production would make the cash register start humming.

But Clessie was an “individualist” and seemed to prefer working all night working out the “bugs” in an invention rather than running the business. It was Clessie's idea that J. Irwin become general manager and thrash out production problems while he increased his time at the workbench.

Miller never had any formal education in business. “Uncle Willie said business can't be taught—you have to learn it,” Miller says.

How well he learned is history. There were 60 employees at the Columbus plant when Miller took over in 1934. Today there are more than 14,000 employees of Cummins scattered throughout the world.

By 1936 the firm had annual sales past the \$1 million mark but never had made a cent of profit since its founding in 1919. First profits were realized in 1937, and it's been a steady climb since. Sales this year are expected to be about \$450 million.

Columbus, county seat of Bartholomew County, has enjoyed an equally steady growth during those years.

“And the county is going to continue growing, Miller says. “At least the local bank is planning that it's going to.” And since Miller is board chairman of the leading bank, he should know.

Success of the family's business ventures seems to have stemmed from a “built-in” knack of putting their investment dollars to work in the right place at the right time—and not wasting any of them.

This lack of waste is seen in Miller's office building. It's the old Irwin Bank building—built in 1881. As it houses Irwin Management Inc. offices it is not a prosperous revenue producing unit. Add to this a nostalgic desire to maintain some of the original “flavor” of the beginning of an empire as a monument—and the building still stands in all its Victorian austerity. The exterior has been carefully restored and preserved and the interior displays tastefully designed and furnished offices. But it's like stepping from one century into the middle of another to walk through the front door.

Miller's office is headquarters of Irwin Management Inc. which handles all of the family financial affairs—“... some real estate, some investing, some venture capital...” he says.

One of the firm's first projects as major developer was Bond Court at Cleveland in 1968. This is a \$20 million office building and convention-type hotel in a downtown urban renewal project. The three-acre site is scheduled for completion in the fall of 1971.

Another development is L'Enfant Plaza at

Washington, D.C.—named in honor of Pierre L'Enfant, original planner of the nation's capital. The project consists of two 9-story office buildings separated by a four-acre plaza. It will feature an underground shopping promenade on the lower level with a theater, a service station and three levels of parking.

Miller is credited by other town leaders with being "the man whose interest and financing of quality architecture brought Columbus the title 'Athens of the Prairie.'" And he constantly is pushing others to make greater strides in improving all of Bartholomew County.

Recently he told a meeting of the Junior Chamber of Commerce: "You men are still young. You have fewer ingrained prejudices about 'going back to the good old days'—I wish I were one of you. I am jealous of you and your chance."

As proof that he means exactly what he said, in June, 1969, senior management of Cummins took an unusual step and recommended the directors elect, as the active operating management of the company, a group of young men whose average age is under 40.

The Cummins annual report says: "We consider these men extraordinarily able, and it is our belief that companies today will be best led by younger men of energy and competence, who are at home in the new conditions of the industry and market, who know how to live with change and who welcome change and seek to exploit its opportunities."

While this is a good break for the "youngsters" they still will have to press hard to keep up with the boss. His talent for keeping "on the go" is well known.

Miller is a student of history. He reads the ancient classics regularly in Greek and Latin and has been a long-time student of the Bible. He feels a scholarly interest in the past is a necessary resource on which one must draw to understand the present and perceive the future.

In 1960 Miller was the first layman ever named to head the National Council of Churches. He headed the Council through 1963 and advocated criticism of the church as a healthy thing to "keep them on their toes."

"I have considerable gratitude for right-wingers who have attacked the National Council," he says. "The church ought always to welcome criticism—the church is always strengthened by attacks from the outside. If it goes down, it goes down because of apathy and corruption on the inside."

Further, he recommends participation by the church in controversial affairs. "It gives them the opportunity of a lifetime," he says. "Your ministry can be more effective than your father's ever could. The rise of right-wing criticism is evidence that the church is influential."

On the matter of criticism by the church, he says: "The one kind of Communist infiltration in the church I fear is the kind that would make it over into the image of the government—as you have in the Russian church. There the church lets society go its own way uncorrected, a real perversion of the historic mission of the church."

"The mission of the church is to be in the world with both feet. The greatest thing the church could do for Communism would be to back out of the world. Genuine anti-Communism comes when you don't let society rest on its evils."

Moral strength and responsibility is the subject of many of Miller's discussions with church and lay leaders. He illustrates his thoughts with a moral-carrying story he remembers from the 7th grade.

"In a manual training class I learned to make drawings, to use saws, chisels and planes. Finally I had to make an upholstered footstool which would pass my teacher's critical inspection."

"This came pretty hard for me," he recalls. "But I did manage to get the pieces made and ready to put together. After they had been glued, a variety of clamps were applied, aimed at keeping the pieces together until the glue could set. After several days I was instructed to remove the clamps."

"My teacher then gave me a great fright," says Miller. "He took up my stool and began pulling on the legs to see if they would come apart. Finally this 200-pound man actually sat on my stool, and I doubt if I can ever forget the relief and pride which I felt at first learning that my stool could be put to use."

Miller used this example in a talk to an assembly of the National Council as an example of how well the council had been "glued together" and was serving the purpose for which it had been formed. He compares religion to a "glue"—an agent which binds men together and binds them to God.

Miller considers himself an "amateur politician"—he is a member of the Republican Finance Committee and in 1968 was chairman of Citizens for Rockefeller. He was a member of the President's Commission on Postal Organization and feels strongly that postal service could be greatly improved if the Post Office Department were operated as a corporation, not politically controlled.

In 1968 Miller was a member of the President's Committee on Urban Housing.

He is a strong civil rights advocate and speaks out loudly on "human" treatment for all races and creeds.

"My views on civil rights are those which are expressed by the law," he says simply. "The color of your skin isn't important."

"Columbus has a small population of minorities. And we have a very good and enforceable open housing ordinance. I supported its adoption."

Miller's feelings on equal rights for all were incorporated into the Cummins plant in the early 1930s. "Cummins was the first plant in southern Indiana to be open without restriction," he says proudly. "And it has been that way ever since."

Despite the fact Miller heads a growing corporation he has often spoken against the threat of corporations to individualism.

"I am a firm believer in individualism as a creative force," he stresses.

But he notes that conforming to the status quo tends to stifle individual creative thinking and inventiveness.

"Man has organized to get what he wants," Miller says. "This organization has brought on conformity. Perhaps for the greater number of human beings this conforming is no great worry—because organization has its comforts for the mind and spirit as well as for the body."

"Because of this organization we are no longer compelled to walk if we don't want to. The organization transports us. And for our minds the organization supplies acceptable opinions on politics, on business, on labor, on marriage or religion—we do not have to think for ourselves if we do not wish. And most of the time this is a comfort."

"And while it is fashionable to view this situation with alarm," he says, "the truth is most of the time we love it."

Miller notes that a tendency toward conformity is as true among executives as it is among workers and blames it to a fear of not being entirely accepted if they are "different."

Miller says he constantly searches for outstanding men in his organization—the ones who are creative and who are looking for more things to do or a different way to do them. Whenever a job opens, Miller has department heads make an alphabetical list of men who might qualify. They are eliminated one by one—only for good reasons. Seniority is not the final qualification for promotion. The system has "discovered" some top talent that otherwise might have

been lost—or, at least, hidden for a longer time, Miller feels.

Miller and his wife, Xenia, have five children—three girls and two boys, ranging in ages from 13 to 25.

"The boys are the youngest," Miller says.

When asked if they are being groomed to step into his job, he smiles briefly and says:

"They haven't decided yet what they want to be. It's up to them. I just want them to do well whatever they decide to do."

HOGAN QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after President Nixon's July 1970, message on the state of our Nation's economy, I sent a questionnaire to 217,000 homes in my congressional district asking my constituents' views on the President's message and his recommendations for congressional action.

For the information of my colleagues, I would like to share with them my newsletter on the responses which I received to this questionnaire. I include this newsletter at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1970.

DEAR FRIEND: Last month you received a questionnaire from me asking for your views on the problems of our economy. At this writing, 11,864 responses have been received. Because there have been so many responses, it is impossible to send everyone a personal letter. I am, however, sending you this report so you will know the results of the survey and so you can compare your answers with those of your neighbors.

I am very pleased that so many of you also took advantage of the additional space we provided for a personal message to let me know your feelings about other issues. I personally read every one of your notes.

This is the best way I know to keep myself informed as to your views. I will keep them in mind as I attend to my legislative duties in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Member of Congress.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

The following represents a tabulation of all individual responses.

1. Do you think President Nixon's efforts to curb inflation are working?

	Percent
Yes	27
No	58
Undecided	15

2. If prices could be reduced, would you be willing to take a cut in pay?

	Percent
Yes	41
No	46
Undecided	13

3. Should our unemployment insurance system be expanded?

	Percent
Yes	28
No	58
Undecided	14

4. Do you favor an automatic increase in manpower training funds in times of high unemployment?

	Percent
Yes	46
No	43
Undecided	11

5. Should the authority of the Small Business Administration be increased to stimulate banks and others to make loans to small businesses at lower interest rates?

	Percent
Yes	65
No	23
Undecided	12

CONGRESSMAN LARRY HOGAN COMMENTS ON THE QUESTIONS

1. Do you think President Nixon's efforts to curb inflation are working?

Although the President's program has not shown any marked success, there have been small hopeful signs. For example, while the increase in the consumers' price index varies from month to month, it no longer shows the strong rising trend. The index of wholesale prices, which usually leads the consumers' price index is pointing to a slower rate of inflation. The even more sensitive index of basic commodity prices has been declining since February.

It should be remembered that the President inherited the conditions caused by years of excessive government spending and the attempt of the previous administration to provide "guns and butter" simultaneously. We cannot really solve the problems of inflation until we end the Viet Nam War. Obviously, one of the main ways to curb inflation is to reduce unnecessary government spending. Unfortunately, the Congress has consistently increased programs beyond the President's budget, demonstrating astounding fiscal irresponsibility. The pattern is the same for virtually every program: The President requests a certain level of spending, the House increases that amount, the Senate then increases the amount approved by the House and then, after a conference, a program in excess of the House amount is invariably agreed upon. This is not the way to fight inflation or to keep taxes down.

2. If prices could be reduced, would you be willing to take a cut in pay?

This question (which confused many of those who responded) was designed to find out my constituents' feelings on wage and price controls without using the specific words which I thought might prejudice the responses.

President Nixon, in his message on the economy June 17, 1970, said that he does not favor wage and price controls because they would lead to rationing, black marketing, total Federal bureaucratic domination and would never get at the real causes of inflation.

There are pros and cons on wage and price controls, and there is a serious question as to whether or not the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. However, on July 31, 1970, I voted for a bill, the Defense Production Act, H.R. 17880, which, among other things, gives the President stand-by authority to impose wage and price controls.

Because of the great many constituents who mentioned the Congressional pay raise in connection with this question, I would like to reiterate and clarify my position on that increase.

I did not vote myself a pay raise as some have charged. In fact, I consistently opposed this ill-timed salary increase for Members of Congress. Congress established the mechanism to allow this pay raise to come to pass before I was elected. Early in the first session of the 91st Congress, I signed a discharge petition to force this measure to a floor vote. The petition failed to acquire the requisite number of signatures and the increase went into effect automatically. I feel that it was wholly inappropriate for Members of Congress to receive a salary increase at a time when the country is struggling to cope with inflation and recession.

3. Should our unemployment insurance system be expanded?

In the time since this questionnaire was mailed, the unemployment insurance system referred to in this question has been extended to include 4.4 million of the 16.6 million jobs not covered under prior law.

The responses to this question indicate that many people confused this unemployment insurance system with welfare programs. I completely agree with the numerous people who feel our welfare system must be totally revamped to prevent fraud and to make sure that able-bodied recipients are required to work. The unemployment compensation program, however, is not really a welfare program. It is operated through the States and is financially supported by employers, and State and Federal sources, with benefits from the program being limited and based upon the individual's previous employment record.

4. Do you favor an automatic increase in manpower training funds in times of high unemployment?

Manpower training programs are designed to make possible the permanent full-time employment of those who are unemployed and considered unemployable, by removing barriers and by providing those in low-income jobs with the training and opportunity to move up the career ladder. Today, the Federal Government alone spends approximately \$3 billion in a variety of poorly coordinated training programs.

Although I fully support adequate funding of a coordinated and efficient manpower training system, I am concerned about the provision in this legislation which provides the automatic increase in funding during times of high unemployment. The past performances of these programs do not reflect full and efficient utilization of the funds which are appropriated by Congress. I do not believe that we can assume that full and efficient utilization will automatically follow the enactment of this legislation even though it is designed to improve greatly present efforts. When program performance does warrant the relaxation of Congressional controls and oversight on these particular programs, then is the time to consider legislating automatic appropriations.

5. Should the authority of the Small Business Administration be increased to stimulate banks and others to make loans to small businesses at lower interest rates?

Because small business is the heart of our economy—contributing approximately 40 percent of the Nation's jobs and the gross national product—it is in the interest of all consumers to see that we maintain a healthy small business community. Seventeen years ago, President Eisenhower established the Small Business Administration and today there are in the United States an estimated 5,400,000 independent businesses, of which 95 percent are small by SBA size standards.

To assist the small businessman further, I feel that the SBA should be permitted to delegate to the banks the authority to make loans that SBA guarantees, provided the bank retains a portion of the risk. Such a program will stimulate the growth of our small businesses and encourage the enterprising individual who wants to make a start on his own.

In calendar year 1969, Prince Georges and Charles Counties received a total of \$666,200 for 18 SBA loans. This total amount included 11 business loans amounting to \$474,500, three economic opportunity loans amounting to \$41,800, and four disaster loans amounting to \$149,900.

Many of you who responded to this questionnaire asked why more issues weren't covered. Two previous newsletters, sent to all homes in the Fifth District in October and November 1969, contained questionnaires on other issues. The results of these two questionnaires were reported in my February, 1970, newsletter.

For those who may have missed both the questionnaires and the results, the final tabulations are repeated below.

OCTOBER 1969 NEWSLETTER QUESTIONNAIRE

1—Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit voluntary nondenominational prayer in public schools? Yes: 71%, No: 29%.

2—Do you favor conversion of the Post Office Department into a self-supporting government-owned corporation? Yes: 78%, No: 22%.

3—Do you favor a voluntary army over present draft? Yes: 61%, No: 39%.

4—Do you feel we are putting too much of our resources into military spending? Yes: 65%, No: 35%.

NOVEMBER 1969 NEWSLETTER QUESTIONNAIRE

	Percent
I support President Nixon's Vietnam plans	59
I favor immediate unilateral withdrawal of all troops	24
I favor an all-out effort to win the war in Vietnam	17
Total	100

With regard to the above October, 1969 questionnaire: (1) I have co-sponsored the constitutional amendment to permit voluntary nondenominational prayer in public schools; (2) I co-authored and worked for the postal reform legislation which was handled by one of the committees on which I serve; (3) the voluntary army proposal is still pending; (4) I have consistently supported amendments reducing military spending.

With regard to the November, 1969 questionnaire, I have consistently supported President Nixon's plan of phased withdrawal in Viet Nam.

NEED FOR MISSILE DEFENSE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial in the Washington Post by Joseph Alsop, this erudite writer gave a succinct account of our failure to develop missiles equal to or better than the new SAM-2's and SAM-3's. This same deficiency also applies to our inability to develop means of detecting, deflecting, or shooting down the Styx missile.

I feel that without doubt Mr. Alsop is right and that immediate steps must be taken to improve the Shrike missile to where it is capable of countering the SAM-2's and SAM-3's, and further that we must now work intensely for a means of detecting, deflecting or shooting down the Styx missile.

I commend Mr. Alsop's article for your perusal:

OUR DECAYING DEFENSE

(By Joseph Alsop)

Mercifully, we are not going to skimp on the national defense quite so dangerously as the Nixon administration originally intended. The first orders disseminated in the Pentagon—and with a war still on—were to cut next year's defense budget by another \$6 billion.

With current defense spending running under \$74 billion per annum, that meant bringing the budget down into the upper

\$60 billion range. And that further meant a shocking degree of American disarmament behind the deceptive facade, as it were, of the fighting in Vietnam.

To give one example, the vital Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean is already much too weak. The Soviet naval presence has been greatly increased; but the real danger is the deployment of more and more Soviet air-power and missile-power in Egypt. Even today, therefore, the Sixth Fleet would have to be heavily reinforced.

With the further naval cuts that would have been required by an over-all defense cut of \$6 billion, the Sixth Fleet's position in the Mediterranean would have become absolutely untenable. Yet its withdrawal would have amounted to an order to Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir to lead her people straight into the sea, and it would also have made the Mediterranean into a Soviet lake in a very short space of time.

The effects of the proposed economies on the other armed services were just about equal to the case above-given. More than one of the chiefs of staff therefore exercised their legal right—so rarely used in the past—to appeal directly and personally to the President himself.

There was, in fact, a kind of interim showdown. President Nixon therefore reduced the economy demand in half, to cuts on the order of \$3 billion. And the joint chiefs hopefully said they could "live with" this.

Yet the evidence is all too clear that they cannot "live with" it, if that means assuring a decent level of security for the U.S. and its allies. The decay in the American defense position is in fact as dangerous as it is shocking.

It dates from the Johnson administration, when everything long range in the defense program began to be sacrificed, in order to pay the bill for the Vietnamese war within a manageable defense budget. But the sacrifices have conspicuously continued under Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, and the resulting decay can now be dramatically documented.

In the old and simple-minded days, when the national defense used to be taken really seriously, counter-weapons were ordered to meet the threat of the Soviet SAM-2 anti-aircraft missile. The result was the Shrike air-to-ground missile. This is a most effective SAM-2 killer, provided the SAM-2s are not of the advanced type now being heavily deployed along the Suez Canal.

It is also clear that the Pentagon had ample warning that more advanced SAM-2s were in production in the Soviet Union, and was aware, too, that these improved SAM-2s used a radar band which would fool the Shrike. The proof is the simple fact that prototypes were produced of an improved Shrike, which can easily kill the advanced SAM-2s.

Yet only prototypes were made, because defense cheeseparing forbade the expense of building a serious stockpile of the improved Shrikes.

This cheeseparing has already produced consequences that can justifiably be described as downright ghastly. The U.S. guaranteed Israel against the Soviet-Egyptian violations of the standstill aspect of the Suez cease-fire. These have so far consisted of massive forward movements of the SAM-2 and SAM-3 battalions. We were bamboozled when we gave the guarantees, but we are none the less deeply committed by them.

If there had been no cheeseparing, it would have been a major compensation to open the Pentagon's inventories. We could then have said to the Israelis: "OK, we were lied to. But here are air-to-ground missiles that will kill these SAM-2s and SAM-3s that have been moved forward by the Soviet and Egyptian promise-breakers."

As it is, we have feebly offered the old model Shrikes, which are no good against

the most of the weapons system that is becoming such a dire threat to Israel. One may be sure, too, that this deplorable episode typifies a general condition of decay.

We ought to be raising the defense budget, but instead the rate of decay is merely being slowed a little.

**BISHOP L. L. SCAIFE, OF BUFFALO,
LEADER OF CHURCH, COMMUNITY**

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of a distinguished, internationally known, and respected churchman, Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, who retired last June as bishop of the Episcopal diocese of western New York.

Bishop Scaife died last Saturday, September 19 at his home in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y. He elected to take early retirement last June after contracting a serious illness which made it clear to him that he would not be able to resume his priestly duties.

His passing is a deep personal loss to me. During his tenure at Buffalo since 1948, I had come to know him well and to benefit continuously from his broad experience and wise counsel.

Another priest described Bishop Scaife as "every inch a bishop; but he was tenderhearted; he was wrung with peoples troubles." What a wonderful and appropriate tribute.

I recall my meeting with him after he returned from the World Council of Churches Assembly in India some years ago. The depth of his understanding and his concern was truly heartwarming in whatever problem he encountered.

Bishop Scaife was an outstanding exponent of the ecumenical spirit, perhaps most conspicuously highlighted when he was offered and accepted the use of the Roman Catholic Cathedral in Buffalo for the installation of his successor, since his own cathedral could not accommodate the throngs that desired to attend.

He was indeed an outstanding ambassador of good will for his diocese, his community, and his country.

I recall with pleasure his visit to my Washington office, as well as the many meetings—formal and informal—which I had with him in Buffalo. Several times, most recently last June, I have had occasion to call attention to his work and his philosophies in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, my heart grieves at the loss of this great man. We all can be grateful for his having been with us, but we shall miss having his valuable contributions to the issues of the days ahead.

I extend my sincerest condolence to his devoted wife and their two daughters and to the Buffalo Episcopal diocese which has lost its great leader.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an obituary from Sundays Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express:

**LAURISTON L. SCAIFE, EPISCOPAL BISHOP, DIES
AT AGE OF 62**

The Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, 62, internationally known bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York for 22 years until his retirement last June 1, died at 3:30 p.m. Saturday in his home at the Park Lane Apartments, Gates Cir., after a long illness.

Bishop Scaife, who advanced his retirement date more than two years—from his 65th birthday, Oct. 17, 1972—for health reasons, was automatically succeeded by the Rt. Rev. Harold B. Robinson, elevated from bishop coadjutor.

Burial offices will be read in the presence of diocesan clergy at 10 a.m. Tuesday in St. Paul's Cathedral, Shelton Square, where the body will lie in state until 10 p.m. that evening.

A Requiem Eucharist will be celebrated at 10:30 a.m. Wednesday in the cathedral. Burial will be in the family plot at Hingham, Mass.

Consecrated seventh bishop of the seven-county diocese on May 13, 1948, Bishop Scaife was a major influence in the church, in the civic affairs of the Buffalo area and in the world-wide ecumenical movement.

GIVEN CHANCELLOR'S MEDAL

A dynamic leader in the church and the community, he was honored with the Chancellor's Medal at the University of Buffalo's 1970 commencement, Mrs. Scaife, the former Eleanor M. Carnochan, accepted the award for her husband who was ill at home.

In presenting the award, Martin Meyerson, outgoing UB president, cited Bishop Scaife as being "a rare individual who, by his character, can show men of all backgrounds that they are indeed united by a common humanity... a man whose warmth can melt the barriers which impede understanding and good will."

The invitation extended by the Most Rev. James A. McNulty, bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, to hold the ceremony consecrating Bishop Robinson as a bishop early in 1968 at St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Cathedral and Bishop Scaife's acceptance set a Catholic-Protestant Episcopal precedent in this country.

UNITY OF ANGLICANS, CATHOLICS SOUGHT

In church circles Bishop Scaife was known in the United States, Canada and Europe for promoting unity between Anglicans (Episcopalians and others in the worldwide Church of England family) and Eastern Orthodox Catholics.

He had private audiences with His Holiness the Patriarch Athenagoras, world leader of Eastern Orthodox Catholics, and with the late Pope John XXIII, also deeply interested in unity with the Orthodox Church—an interest continued by successor, Pope Paul VI.

Bishop Scaife served as a member of the Episcopal delegation to the World Council of Churches General Assembly in New Delhi, India, in 1961.

NINE CONGREGATIONS FORMED

The next year Bishop Scaife visited the Soviet Union with a delegation of American religious leaders sent by the National Council of Churches to observe church life and meet with church leaders in Russia.

During Bishop Scaife's noteworthy 22-year tenure as bishop of the Western New York diocese he established nine new congregations and opened many new church buildings.

His community outreach was reflected in the founding during his term of a teen-age coffee house in South Buffalo, the Southwestern Area Migrant Committee of Fredonia; St. Augustine's Center, an urban mission on Humboldt Pky.; and St. Philip's Community Center for young and old on Goodell St.

During Bishop Scaife's tenure the number

of Sunday school teachers in the diocese was increased from 600 to 1,000 and the number of students rose by more than 1,300.

He was recognized as a leading diplomat in the United States for dealing with the Orthodox Church.

For many years he was national chairman of the Episcopal Church's commission for dealing with Eastern Orthodox, Polish National Catholic and Old Catholic churches.

LAUDED FOR ECUMENICAL SPIRIT

When the Very Rev. James J. McGinley, SJ, presented the Distinguished citizen's Award of Canisius College to Bishop Scaife in 1966, he said: "The spirit of ecumenism has been his possession for long years . . . (he) is a combination of patriotism and intelligence and Christian charity . . ."

Born in Milton, Mass., Oct. 17, 1907, Bishop Lauriston Livingston Scaife was attracted to the ministry as a choir boy of 12 at St. Michael's Church, Milton. The inspiration provided by the rector, Rev. H. Boyd Edwards, helped seal his decision.

Earlier in his youth Bishop Scaife had begun studying the piano and organ, an interest he continued through his life.

He served as assistant organist at both the Milton Academy, a preparatory school, and at Trinity College, where he earned a bachelor of arts degree in 1931.

BEGAN AS NEW YORK CURATE

Later, he taught classical language at St. Paul's School in Concord, N.H., and studied at Gottingen University in Germany and at the Harvard Graduate School.

He received the degree of sacred theology from the General Theological Seminary in 1937. While there he taught New Testament Greek.

Bishop Scaife was ordained to the Episcopal priesthood in 1938. He began his ministry as curate at St. Thomas Episcopal Church, New York City.

He served subsequently as rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, Newport, R.I., from 1942 to 1945; and as rector of Calvary Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., from 1945 to 1948.

WAS NAVY CHAPLAIN

From 1944 to 1946 Bishop Scaife served in the Navy first as a prison chaplain and later was assigned aboard a ship in the South Pacific.

He was unanimously elected bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York on the first ballot on Jan. 20, 1948, succeeding the Rt. Rev. Cameron J. Davis.

An observer noted that Bishop Scaife "came to the diocese at a critical time—following a depression and war. It was badly fractured—financially, socially and from the viewpoint of churchmanship."

Another priest said of Bishop Scaife: "He was every inch a bishop, but he was very tenderhearted; he was wrung by people's troubles. If he heard someone was sick, he might appear personally at the hospital, or call the patient's rector."

EVERY INCH A BISHOP

"He was a quick study; he grasped the salient points and didn't get bogged down with details. He thought in large terms, in the grand design."

"Bishop Scaife had a high regard for the old, in the best sense of the word, yet he was not afraid to venture into new territory. He had good balance in every area—social, theological and ecclesiastical."

Just before his retirement Bishop Scaife was asked what he would point out to members of the 75 churches and to Buffalo as a city.

He commented: "I would like to remind both the people of the church and the people of the city that they must settle for nothing less than perfection in their own lives and the life of their community."

STRIVE FOR PERFECTION

"There is no such thing as 'half a saint'. Any more than there is a 'partially starving' child."

"We must pray constantly that God will strip us of our pride and sin, while we labor to strip our city of its slums, its polluted air and its racial injustice."

In addition to receiving a doctorate from the General Theological Seminary, Bishop Scaife was presented a doctor of divinity degree from Trinity College.

In 1949 he received a doctor of sacred theology degree from Hobart and William Smith Colleges. He also received doctor of divinity degrees from Trinity College, Toronto, Ont.; and the University of King's College, Halifax, N.S.; doctor of laws degree from Alfred University and doctor of theology degree from the St. Sergius Theological Academy of Paris.

A 33rd degree Mason, Bishop Scaife was chaplain of the Lodge of the Ancient Landmarks of Buffalo.

ACTIVE IN COMMUNITY

In 1961 he was elected grand chaplain of the Grand Council of Royal and Select Masters of the State of New York.

While bishop of the diocese he was president ex-officio of the Executive Council of the Board of Managers of the Church Charity Foundation, chairman of the Diocese Board of Trustees and of the trustees of DeVeaux School, Niagara Falls.

He also was a trustee of the Boards of Hobart and William Smith Colleges, the General Theological Seminary and a member of the standing committee on the Theological School, Bexley Hall; and of the Corporation of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary.

Bishop Scaife was a trustee of the Nichols School in Buffalo, an honorary member of the Board of Directors of the Urban League, a life member of the Buffalo & Erie County Historical Society and the Buffalo Science Museum, a board member of the Randolph Children's Home and of the Park School of Buffalo.

He is survived by his wife of 31 years, Eleanor, and two daughters, Mrs. Thomas Hadjilis of Stuyvesant, and Mrs. Barclay F. Gordon of New York City.

INCENTIVES NEEDED TO BRING DOCTORS INTO RURAL INDIANA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Bedford-Indiana-Daily Times-Mail of August 20, 1970:

RURAL DOCTORS

A proposal by Ninth District Congressman Lee Hamilton for a federal program providing incentive for professionals in the healing arts to locate in small, rural communities, is no less than intriguing and may have considerable merit.

Aimed at encouraging young physicians, dentists and optometrists to begin their practices in medically deprived areas, the proposal, contained a bill introduced by Hamilton, would repay in full the educational debt of any of these professionals who agrees to practice for three years in an area in which shortages of those services exist.

The incentive would be a powerful one. If a student could recover his cost of medical education, or receive funds with which to pay debts incurred while getting his education,

he would be in greatly improved financial situation as he begins practice. The amount would be a substantial one, but information we have received does not spell out what educational expenses would be paid—whether the amount would include all costs, including living costs, or such things as tuition, books, fees, etc. In either case, the incentive would be strong.

Most medical and dental students coming out of college to begin practice have withstood severe economic problems which develop through eight years or more of college. One parent calculated a few years ago that the total consideration—costs of living and education, loss of income while a student was establishing practice—at more than \$100,000. Fortunately, young medical and dental professionals have in most cases good borrowing power to get going.

There is no secret that small communities almost everywhere have seen the disappearance of doctors and dentists. They have concentrated in the more heavily populated areas for several reasons, primarily economic. They usually go where they can enjoy a full practice.

We doubt the necessity of having dentists and optometrists locate in the small communities because most people make advance appointments for their services. But a person in a small community residing 15 or 20 miles from the nearest doctor or hospital may be in dire circumstances in certain sudden ailments.

Hamilton said there were 65 cosponsors of the bill to provide financial subsidy to young medical art graduates.

He said the Ninth District, being predominantly rural, has been especially hard hit by a physician shortage. "There are very few communities in the district that have enough doctors," he said. "Much of my time," he added, "is taken in helping communities find physicians and in seeking assistance in financing medical facilities."

He said there is a general migration of medical talent from the midwest and a shortage of opportunities for internships, residencies and continuing medical education in Indiana. Also, he said an insufficient number of young people are choosing medical careers.

Hamilton said that if every student who graduated from medical, dental or optometry school last year enrolled in the program, the nation-wide cost would be \$130 million. If 10 per cent enrolled, the cost would be about \$10 million. He compared this with the \$290 million cost of developing a super jet transport plane.

Something to ponder.

THE PASSPORT CRISIS—A PROGRAM REPORT

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, beginning July 1, post offices in 11 U.S. cities began accepting passport applications as part of a 6-month experiment involving the Post Office Department and the U.S. Passport Office. This experiment has been of special significance to the residents of Connecticut. We have had a genuine passport crisis in our State, and until now the service provided for the \$2 application fee and \$10 issuing fee has too often been characterized by waiting lines and delays.

The Passport Office, observing its 100th anniversary this year, maintains agencies in Washington, D.C., New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Miami, New Orleans, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, and Houston. With the proliferation of people interested in travel abroad and the increased mobility and sophistication of the American traveler, the load has just been too great for the limited number of passport offices.

Mr. Speaker, my feeling has been that the proper approach to a solution to the overload ought to be uncomplicated and to the point. Consequently, I introduced H.R. 13123, a bill to provide more efficient and convenient passport services to our citizens, in the first session of this Congress. It was, simply and forthrightly, a bill to authorize and empower the Passport Office of the Department of State to establish, staff, and maintain passport agencies and passport service offices at new locations, according to need. During hearings on this measure earlier this year, several of my colleagues and I underscored the gravity of the passport crisis in Connecticut and other States and demanded immediate action by the State Department to alleviate the problem.

I felt then, as I do now, Mr. Speaker, that my bill is still the best approach toward solving the problem. But action has not been forthcoming on the bill, and a new opportunity for attacking the backlog and waiting line for passports arose out of the report of the Secretary of State's Committee To Expedite Travel shortly after the hearings on H.R. 13132. A select panel created earlier this year to study long-range trends in foreign travel and headed by former U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall, the Committee recommended the Post Office experiment as a method of alleviating the long lines and other delays. Eight of the eleven sites for the experiment are in Connecticut. Again, while I would have much preferred another method of handling the passport crisis, I felt that the Post Office experiment was an opportunity for the people of Connecticut and the Nation which must not be missed. The experiment has now been running for a few months. It is scheduled to end December 1, 1970. Some of the results are now in from the Connecticut test sites, Detroit, Houston, and Midland, Tex. They are rather well summarized in an article by Bill Andronikos in the September 23 issue of *Federal Times*. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *RECORD* as follows:

JOINT EFFORT SUCCEEDING IN SPEEDING
PASSPORTS

(By Bill Andronikos)

WASHINGTON.—A joint State Department-Post Office experiment to alleviate frustrating delays and long waiting lines for overseas-bound Americans seeking passports reportedly is meeting with marked success.

This is believed to be the first time ever, according to officials from both governmental units, that two federal departments with completely different and unrelated functions have joined efforts in a cooperative move designed to find ways to improve a public service for Americans.

The unprecedented venture already is chalking up dividends in cutting down on passport delays—and has prompted encouraging statements from officials of both departments.

Currently, the experimental program—involving the use of first class post offices to accept passport applications—is being used in some 11 passport crises areas across the country.

Enthusiastic over the reports to date, State Department officials indicated that if the program proves successful by the Dec. 1 terminating date of the postal-passport experiment, the program ultimately might be implemented permanently on a nationwide basis. This means that a travel-minded American's passport would be no further away than this nearest Post Office.

Under the experiment, an American traveler applies for a passport at a post office at one of the designated crises areas. He fills it out and returns it to the postal clerk who promptly forwards it to the State Department's Passport Office which processes the application. When adjudication of the passport is completed, the Passport Office then mails the passport back to its owner.

The experiment was spawned and put into effect July 1 at 11 crises centers as a result of recommendations made by the State Department's Committee to Facilitate Travel, a six-member panel of distinguished Americans appointed by Secretary of State William P. Rogers last March. The function of the committee has been to determine ways on how the government can better serve Americans traveling abroad. The use of post offices for passport applications constituted only one of the committee's numerous recommendations.

The entire project will be evaluated in November and a decision will be forthcoming at that time on the feasibility of implementing the program on a nationwide basis.

John E. Upston, staff director for the Secretary's Committee to Facilitate Travel, said that should the program be adopted nationwide, it would provide "a very significant convenience to Americans applying for a passport, without creating more bureaucracy—and also would take a great deal of the pressure off the existing passport agencies."

Implementation of a nationwide program of this nature, Upston explained, would free passport personnel to perform their passport adjudication duties. This would mean a speedier processing of a greater volume of passports.

On the heels of the reported successes involving the use of post offices for passport application handling, State Department officials interviewed by *Federal Times* paid high compliments and tribute to the efforts of both the postal employees participating in the experimenting and to the personnel within State's Passport Office and its regional units.

For example, Upston said he personally visited some of the areas in which the experiment has been put into effect—and was impressed by the interest and determination shown by postal employees to make the program a success.

"Post Office people," Upston said "are doing a tremendous job in handling passport applications—and they do so in a very thorough, professional way."

Much of the success has been attributed to the training postal personnel already have received in handling the multitude of forms the Post Office has to deal with in its daily chores, such as registered mail, postal money order and numerous other similar functions.

Officials from both departments have indicated that it is because of such training and expertise that postal clerks fit into plans to use them for handling passport applications.

Upston also was encouraged by the response from the public on the use of postal clerks for passport applications. He described the public reaction to date as "extremely favorable."

In addition, Upston lauded the top officials of both departments, including Sec-

retary Rogers and Postmaster General Winton Blount, for their insight in agreeing to try the recommendation that postal employees be given a chance to handle passport applications on a trial basis in parts of the country where the passport rush has swelled to mammoth proportions. Both departments signed an agreement to put the plan into effect.

Postal officials reached acknowledged that the Post Office has sufficient flexibility to enable it to include the handling of passport applications in the experiments being conducted at the passport crises areas.

Van Seagraves, Post Office public information officer for finance and administration, said that the passport test program "represents the kind of public service that a strengthened postal service can provide."

Seagraves indicated that the Post Office already has adequate facilities to render this additional service in the public interest—and that the department could do so without additional overhead cost.

In lauding the experiment as "an added service to the public," Seagraves said that the postal clerks "have enjoyed doing this—and have found that it makes their jobs a lot more interesting."

Since the July 1 implementation of the pilot project in 11 areas across the country, the Post Office has reported it has handled more than 5,000 passport applications.

Although the figure represents a somewhat modest amount of applications, postal officials say this is because of the usual end-of-summer drop in passport applications. In addition, court clerks have been assisting with passport applications in some of the crises areas.

During April testimony before the House subcommittee on State Department organization and foreign operations investigating the passport problems plaguing sections of the country, William B. Macomber Jr., deputy under secretary of state for administration disclosed that passport applications ranged from a low of 70,000 in November 1968 to a peak of some 250,000 in June 1969, at the height of the overseas travel rush.

At that time, Rep. Wayne Hays, D-Ohio, and chairman of the subcommittee, warned the State Department to start immediate action to alleviate the passport dilemma confronting American citizens seeking approval to travel abroad.

The 11 cities in which the pilot project currently is underway—involving the use of postal clerks to handle passport applications until Dec. 1—include: Houston and Midland, both in Texas; Detroit; and eight Connecticut cities—New Haven, Hartford, Bridgeport, Waterbury, Stamford, Greenwich, New London and Willimantic.

Application fee for a passport is \$2 and the issuing fee is \$10, thus bringing the total amount paid by a passport applicant to \$12. Under the State Department-Post Office agreement, the Post Office will receive \$2 for each application handled.

The agreement between the two departments also specifies that should the results of the test program prove mutually satisfactory, the State Department and the Post Office will agree upon a plan for future operations by Dec. 1. Evaluations of the test program will be made in November.

Another provision of the agreement states that at the test locations, the postmaster would designate clerks to accept passport applications with the understanding that the designated individuals are "responsible, bonded, cash-accountable and accustomed to dealing with the public."

The designated clerks, the agreement adds, will accept passport applications and perform the normal acceptance functions of such applications, with the exception of adjudication and processing of passports which will continue to be carried out by personnel of the State Department's Passport Office.

Upston described the overall agreement between the two departments as being unique, in that it brought together two cabinet heads in an effort to solve "a significant problem."

In addition to the use of post office facilities, the committee has suggested expansion of the present application system to include county clerks in 1,500 counties throughout the United States.

Also, the committee stressed that a study be made to determine the desirability and feasibility of establishing regional passport issuing centers. These "passport plants," as Upston described them, would be used solely in the adjudication of passport applications, issuance of passports and maintenance of records. They would not need to be located in midtown areas, and could very well be located in suburban areas, Upston added.

Consequently, the State Department has set up a task force, under the direction of the Office of Management, to review the possibility of establishing passport issuing centers. The task force also will delve into other recommendations made by the Committee to Facilitate International Travel.

Other committee proposals currently being given State Department consideration include:

Reorganization of 10 passport field agencies to help alleviate their burden in preparing passports. The Passport Office—headed by Miss Frances Knight and currently observing its 100th anniversary this year—maintains passport agencies in 11 major cities. These are: Washington, D.C.; New York; Philadelphia; Boston; Chicago; Miami; New Orleans; Los Angeles; San Francisco; Seattle and Houston.

Simplification of the current U.S. passport application and of the passport itself as a prerequisite for the eventual development of a standardized, internationally acceptable passport, possibly a single card, adaptable to automated, electronic processing.

Upgrading the State Department's passport and visa offices to strengthen the consular function of the foreign service and introduction of legislation to amend the statutory requirement that the passport and visa offices be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, as currently is the case.

Support of objective to facilitate tourist travel to the United States and pursuit of legislation along those lines.

Establishment of an Inter-Agency Committee of International Travel Facilitation.

In appointing the Committee to Facilitate Travel last February, Secretary Rogers named former U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall as its chairman.

Other members of the Committee include: Tom C. Clark, former Supreme Court justice; John W. Hanes Jr., New York investment banker and former administrator of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs; John A. McCone, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency and under secretary of the Air Force; Mrs. Florence Lowe, communications media executive; and Charles C. Tillinghast, chairman of the board of Trans-World Airlines.

Upston is a New York financial consultant. David A. Betts, a foreign service officer, is executive assistant.

have appeared in the Washington Post this week discussing the President's frustrations with the Congress and his desire for reform. Mr. Broder contends that Vice President AGNEW's denunciations of the "troglodytic leftists who dominate Congress now" and who are guilty, in the Vice President's eyes, of blocking reform and the President's programs will not wash.

The men who have blocked reform, revenue sharing and the rest—

Broder says—

are the senior members of both parties who control the agendas of the legislative committees. If Mr. Nixon really wanted to speed his "age of reform," he'd have Mr. Agnew out there calling for the replacement of the old fogies of both parties in the House and Senate.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken twice to the House about the need for reform of the present seniority system which overwhelms the operations of the House. Mr. Broder's remarks are well taken. In his second article, Broder demonstrates the effect of removing the top third from the roster of the standing House committees. His conclusions make fascinating reading. They show that real reform would very probably be the order of the day if these less "senior" members were to take over.

It is ironic that the very people whom the President and Vice President so readily attack are often their strongest allies. Without the less "established" Members of Congress, the President's programs would not have a chance.

I recommend these articles to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 15, 1970]

TROGLODYTE PROBLEM

(By David S. Broder)

"It seems like only yesterday," Barry Goldwater told the Young Americans for Freedom last week, "that I stood in Madison Square Garden addressing your great rally of 1961 and prophesied that conservatism would indeed become the wave of the future."

The senator from Arizona recalled that was before he had been nominated for President before Richard Nixon had been elected, "before we even heard of a man named Spiro Agnew or a group known as the silent majority." He added, perhaps unnecessarily, that the accuracy of his prediction was becoming "more evident every day."

On the same day Goldwater spoke in Hartford, Vice President Agnew was kicking off the 1970 GOP campaign—"a second critical phase," as he called it, "in the historic contest begun in the fall of 1968 . . . between remnants of the discredited elite that dominated national policy for 40 years and a new national majority, forged and led by the President of the United States."

It is not at all clear that the "wave of the future" will manifest itself in anything approaching "a new national majority" in the mid-term election. Tradition, the polls and the unemployment figures all point to a Republican setback in the House. The Senate picture is still clouded with uncertainty.

But leaving aside this "pusillanimous pussyfooting" punditry, as Mr. Agnew would say, what the deuce is it that our new conservative masters have in mind to replace the policies of the "discredited elite?"

Fortunately, we do not have to guess. Mr. Nixon himself supplied an 11,000-word answer in his Friday epistle to the errant Congress. And if Mr. Agnew does not object to

an aging "radical-liberal" journalist saying so, it was a darn good answer.

It strengthened the feeling that if we are fated to be governed by conservatives, this isn't the worst fate we could have, by a long shot.

They are rather stuffy and occasionally sour, but on the substantive questions they are not nearly as bad as they might be. We could have conservatives who are hellbent on fattening the military; these men have put the Pentagon on its leanest rations in years. We might have conservatives determined to remove communism from every village in Vietnam; Mr. Nixon wants mainly to get out, though he sometimes scares you out of your wits with a Cambodian operation in the process.

The harshest sustainable indictment of these Republicans is that they lack the one virtue conservatives are supposed to be born with: Competence as managers. Despite three major reorganizations and a massive increase in the White House staff, this administration is still a "pitiful, helpless giant," stumbling over its own feet.

Its record in handling Congress, the economy, the campuses and the other trouble spots is consistently one of arriving breathless, shortly after the crisis has occurred.

The administration has made a sensible diagnosis of America's ills, and its long-range game plan, which the President sketched again in last week's message, is anything but asinine.

He puts his emphasis where it belongs—on reform of existing institutions and on a rational effort to balance resources, population, economy, environment and overseas obligations so as to make the future tolerable.

What is not clear is whether we can count on the conservatives to carry out their own plan. Mr. Nixon's success in achieving major reform has been limited—a fact that Mr. Agnew blames on the "troglodytic leftists who dominate Congress now."

That analysis will not wash. The men who have blocked draft reform, welfare-reform, revenue-sharing and the rest are the senior members of both parties who control the agendas of the legislative committees. John Stennis and Mendel Rivers, John Williams and Carl Curtis, John Byrnes and Wilbur Mills—all conservatives of impeccable credentials, by administration standards—are the roadblocks to reform.

If Mr. Nixon really wanted to speed his "age of reform," he'd have Mr. Agnew out there calling for the replacement of the old fogies of both parties in the House and Senate.

Knock off the top third of almost every committee roster and that reform legislation would go sailing through.

The problem, Mr. Agnew, is not "troglodytic leftists." It is troglodytic troglodytes.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 17, 1970]

CHANGING CONGRESS: THE LOP-OFF GAME

(By David S. Broder)

A number of readers have taken exception to the notion, advanced recently in this space, that a wholesale turnover in the membership of Congress would have a wholesome effect on the Washington climate. Specifically, it was suggested that if President Nixon wanted to obtain passage of many of the pieces of reform legislation the current Congress has blocked or ignored, "He'd have Mr. Agnew out there (on the campaign trail) calling for the replacement of the old fogies in both parties in the House and Senate."

"Knock off the top third of almost every committee roster, it was suggested, 'and that reform legislation would go sailing through.' Several readers have objected rather strenuously to the notion that so many senior members could be sacrificed without impairing the quality of Congress. Some were unkind enough to hint that the suggestion must

NIXON PROGRAM STUMPED BY SENIORITY

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, two articles by columnist David L. Broder

have been made with precious little thought as to the actual consequences of such a move.

They were, of course, absolutely right. It was one of those heady notions that comes impulsively off the typewriter as deadline approaches. Frankly, it had never occurred to the author that anyone would take the idea seriously enough to examine the effects. But it turns out that there is more to the idea than either its parentage or the circumstances of its birth would lead one to believe.

It is a game anyone can play. Just take the 1970 Congressional Directory, turn to the committee lists, and draw a line one-third the way down the roster of Republicans and Democrats. (For simplicity's sake, you may wish to ignore the changes that have taken place since January, and where the division of the committee yields a fractional result, you may lop off an extra man; you may as well be hung for a sheep as a lamb.)

So the system has its flaws. But look what it does for some of the major committees of the House. Appropriations is now led by two exceptionally tight-fisted gentlemen, George H. Mahon (D-Texas) and Frank T. Bow (R-Ohio). Their position on the political spectrum is roughly indicated by the "liberal quotient" assigned them by Americans for Democratic Action: 11 per cent for Chairman Mahon, and a giddy 17 per cent for ranking Republican Bow.

Perform the recommended surgery on the committee and what do you get? The chairmanship falls to Rep. Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania, who possesses not only the finest waxed moustache on Capitol Hill but an appreciation of the benefits of investments in education and other domestic causes that can be learned only by one who has climbed from the coal fields of Wilkes-Barre to the heights of the Harvard Law School, as he did. And instead of Bow, the ranking republican becomes Rep. Silvio O. Conte of Massachusetts, a reform-minded liberal, who has distinguished himself in battle against everything from the Cow Palace Republican platform of 1964 to unlimited farm subsidies.

You are beginning to warm to the idea, perhaps? Look at Armed Services. Instead of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, who has made his South Carolina district a sort of Pentagon annex, the chairman would be Rep. Otis G. Pike of New York, one of the "fearless five" on the committee who last year had the audacity to lead the first public challenge to the House's routine rubber-stamping of virtually every military request.

Is the environment your interest? The one-third rule would take the chairmanship of the Interior Committee from crusty Wayne N. Aspinall of Colorado and give it to Rep. Morris K. Udall of Arizona, one of the ablest young members of the House.

Do you feel that Congress has been less than responsive to the needs of the big cities and the metropolitan areas on matters of transportation and health? The chairman of the Commerce Committee, which handles such matters, is Rep. Harley O. Staggers, of Keyser, W. Va. (pop. 8,100). The new chairman, under this system, would be Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin of San Diego (pop. 680,000), and the new ranking Republican, replacing Rep. William L. Springer of Illinois, would be Rep. James Harvey, who as mayor of Saginaw, Mich., a city of 100,000, became thoroughly familiar with urban problems and has worked to educate his fellow-Republicans about them.

On the Judiciary Committee, the one-third lop-off would transfer the chairmanship from Rep. Emanuel Celler of Brooklyn to Rep. Robert W. Kastenmeier of Madison, Wis., who is perhaps no more liberal but is about half as old as Celler and two generations closer to today's problems.

But the case rests ultimately on the most important committee of all, the tax-writing

Ways and Means Committee. The one-third rule would not make much difference to the Republicans, substituting one Midwestern conservative, Rep. Harold R. Collier of Illinois, for another, Rep. John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin. But instead of the formidable Rep. Wilbur D. Mills of Arkansas as chairman, there would be—are you ready?—Rep. Martha W. Griffiths of Michigan, a scholarly judicious lady who—among many other accomplishments—has given the whole matter of federal revenue-sharing the most serious scrutiny of any member of the House. Because Mills and Byrnes are opposed, Mr. Nixon has not even been able to get a hearing on his revenue-sharing proposal, which is the keystone of his whole New Federalism program. But the foresighted Mrs. Griffiths' led her subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee in an exploration of the proposal way back in December, 1967.

Here, we have, ladies and gentlemen, a potential chairman of Ways and Means who merits the support of both the Nixon administration and the Women's Lib. The one-third lop-off rule will put her in power. What more can one say? Only this. The results in the Senate are equally fine, and if you doubt it, as Ring Lardner said, "You can look it up."

EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL SAFETY STATISTICS PROGRAM

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, it has become increasingly apparent that there is an effort to secure the suppression of a report by the Delpic Systems & Research Corp.—DSARC—on industrial accident reporting—a report which the taxpayers paid for through the mechanism of the Department of Labor—but which emphatically fails to support the rosy picture the opponents of any meaningful occupational safety legislation have sought to paint of occupational accident reporting and statistics.

Over the 3 years that some elements of the business community have been vigorously resisting the enactment of any meaningful legislation to protect the working men on the job—a position they have not substantively changed by their support of the essentially cosmetic administration safety bill—they have asserted that a total of only 14,000 industrial deaths a year and only 2 million disabling on-the-job accidents a year is nothing to get excited about. On the contrary, they have in effect told the Congress, "the accident rate has improved remarkably since 1926 and the Congress should just sit tight and continue to do nothing and everything will be for the best in the sweet by-and-by."

Given this strategy, Mr. Speaker, it makes considerable sense for the opponents of safety legislation to seek to suppress this latest report. Because the study by Jerome Gordon and his associates shows conclusively that existing reporting systems substantially underreport the actual extent of industrial accidents. The Gordon report suggests that it is possible that serious accidents may be as much as 10 times more frequent than disabling

accidents and that even disabling accidents are seriously underreported. The Gordon report, in short, shows that even if we wished to accept the chamber of commerce notion that 2 million disabling accidents and 14,000 deaths a year are not enough to justify legislation, even that callous attitude would fail to cope with the real size of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, in response to a very vigorous demand by the chairman of the Select Labor Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), the Labor Department has sent the House one copy of what it calls a preliminary draft of the Gordon report. The Department seeks to soften the impact of Mr. Gordon's devastating statistics by saying that the report is "incomplete" and has not been accepted by the Department. The letter of transmittal further states that the report is a consultant's report and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Department in whole or in part.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the problem of the Department of Labor. They gave a contract to a distinguished researcher to find out the true state of the art of industrial accident reporting. He came back with some facts that the opponents of meaningful legislation do not want to believe. But even if these facts do not reflect the view of the Department, they are, nonetheless, important facts which the Congress is entitled to have before it.

The text that is available is a long one and much of it—in quite careful response to what was asked of DSARC—is of primary interest to statisticians and reporting and survey technicians. Chapter 1 of the report contains the meat of the findings and the essence of the recommendations. Mr. Speaker, I include chapter 1 of this very important report at this point in the RECORD:

AN EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL SAFETY STATISTICS PROGRAM

CHAPTER 1—SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AND PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Magnitude of the industrial safety problem

Each year 15,000 workers are killed—more than the total number of battlefield fatalities in any year of the Vietnam war—and 2.2 million workers are injured on the job. Over half a million workers are disabled by occupational diseases from the effects of asbestos, beryllium, carbon monoxide, coal dust, cotton dust, cancer-causing chemicals, dyes, unusual fuels, pesticides, radiation, and other occupational hazards such as heat, noise, or vibration. Each working day brings 55 dead, 8,500 disabled and 27,000 injured.

But the human toll of industrial injury is not by any means the whole picture. In 1966, work accidents and illnesses cost the American economy \$6.8 billion in wage losses, medical expenses, insurance claims, production delays, time losses of other workers, the salvage value of damaged equipment, and fire losses.

In 1966 alone, 255 million man-days were lost due to work injuries, while only 25.4 million man-days were lost due to strikes and work stoppages.

According to some analysts almost 85 per cent of the total labor force is currently exposed to the risk of incurring one or more disabling injuries during a working lifetime, and that 3-5 per cent of the current labor

force will actually experience some form of seriously disabling work injury, including the possibility of loss of limb or life.

Over half a century ago, the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis remarked during the period of initial industrial safety reform that "Arithmetic is the first of the sciences and the mother of safety". However, during the most recent Congressional reviews of omnibus Occupational Safety and Health legislation in the 90th and 91st Congresses, a significant portion of the hearings dealt with the fundamental issue of just how reliable were our industrial work hazards statistics. The annual surveys of work accident statistics collected by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, in conjunction with 16 cooperating state departments of labor, two trade associations, the American Gas Association (A.G.A.), and the Automobile Manufacturers Association (A.M.A.), the National Safety Council and the 33 State Workmen's Compensation Programs provide the basic information upon which most, if not all, of the public and private safety prevention and control programs rest. Yet it was this information derived from hundreds of thousands of industrial establishments that was seriously questioned as to its validity and reliability. Further, suggestions were made in the hearings calling for the adoption of more efficient means of collecting and processing work injury data than those currently in use.

PURPOSE OF THE DELPHIC STUDY

To explore these criticisms and allegations, the Delphic Systems and Research Corporation was engaged by the Labor Standards Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct a broad-ranging review and evaluation of the several national industrial safety statistical reporting programs.

The fundamental purposes of the investigation were three:

- To evaluate the reliability of the existing federal, state, and non-profit industrial work injury statistical programs.
- To test out and evaluate alternative techniques and means for collection or generation of work injury statistical information.
- To present recommendations covering possible redesign of the BLS Annual Survey of Work Injury standards for adoption of alternate procedures for the collection and measurement of work injury statistical information that will materially increase the reliability of the program and will lead to the adoption of more and better informed policy choices for industrial safety prevention and control programs.

ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE OF THE REPORT

The principal findings and recommendations presented here are elaborated in the ensuing discussion in the following chapters of the report. The organization of the report coincides with the scope of the project.

Basically, there are one summary and three substantive portions of the report and the project; they are as follows:

Part I—Summary and Conclusions of the Study.

Part II—A Review and Evaluation of the Current BLS-Cooperative States Annual Survey of Work Injury Program.

Part III—Evaluation and Test of Alternative Means of Collection and Estimation of Work Injury Data.

Part IV—Alternative Strategies for Improving Work Injury Statistical Programs.

Part I—Summary and conclusions of the study

This section of the report elaborates on the purposes, organizational scope, general and specific findings and recommendations of the Study. Reference to supporting chapters for each proposition are provided the reader to explore in greater depth all or selected issues of interest.

Part II—A review and evaluation of the current BLS-Cooperative States annual survey of work injury program.

The first substantive section of the report basically concentrates on a critical examination of the principal national source for work injury experience information: the BLS-Cooperative States Annual Survey of Work Injury. The analysis covers three principal dimensions of effectiveness:

1. The organization, operations and resources of the present program.
2. The composition and representativeness of the reporting universe.
3. Evaluation of the quality of the information applied by reporters.

Organization, operations and resources of the present program

First, an evaluation of the current and prospective relative capabilities of the BLS-Cooperative States Annual Survey to procure and produce reliable estimates and detailed information on work injuries and related information is conducted. This effort contained in Chapter Two included the screening of sample maintenance and quality control procedures used at both the BLS Washington and regional offices and four presently cooperating State programs: New York, Wisconsin, Arkansas and Georgia. In addition a non-cooperating State system; i.e., the State of California, was examined to identify the characteristics and benefits of a major alternate data collection and work injury measurement program relying primarily on Workmen's Compensation reports of work injury. Issues of concern in this discussion include:

- a. Role of the States in the BLS Annual Survey of Work Injury.
- b. Relation of Cooperative State Programs to Other Program Participants.
- c. Evaluation of Cooperative States to other Program Participants.
- d. Recommendations for Improving the Cooperative State Programs.

Composition and representativeness of the Reporting Universe

In this second phase of this section of the report, we deal with the problems of the statistical representativeness of the BLS-Cooperative States Annual Survey of Work Injury. In Chapter Three the industrial, employment size class and regional composition of the Survey reporting universe is displayed and discussed. Chapter Four examines in parallel detail the composition of a statistical benchmark—the Survey of County Business Patterns of the Bureau of the Census. The Survey of County Business Patterns data on industry, employment size class and geographic composition of establishments is considered by many analysts as an appropriate universe to draw comparisons from to determine representativeness of other sample surveys. The last chapter in this section—Chapter Five—compares and analyzes the critical differences in the composition of the BLS-Cooperative States Annual Survey of Work Injury reporting universe with that of the County Business Patterns Survey. Gaps in coverage and recommended alternate approaches to covering them are developed and discussed.

Evaluation of the Quality of the Information Supplied by Reporters

In this third and last portion of this section of the report, a review and analysis is conducted of three critical areas: the sources of survey reports data, the quality of the information reported, and its validity.

The first two items are covered in some detail in Chapters Seven and Eight. There, the purpose, composition and results of a Survey of approximately 200 California reporters to the Annual Survey are examined in some detail. The scope of the DSARC Survey, conducted through a combination of questionnaires and on-site interviews, includes the following items of interest:

- a. Operating Characteristics of the Establishments.
- b. Establishment Work Injury Reporting Organization.
- c. Firm Safety Activities.
- d. Participation in Other Safety Programs.
- e. Maintenance and Use of Basic Work Injury Source Information including alternate experience measurement concepts.
- f. Preparation of Exposure and Work Injury Information.
- g. Evaluation of BLS Work Injury Reporting System.

The last item, validation of the information reported by firms responding to the BLS Annual Survey of Work Injury, is discussed at some length in Chapter Six. To validate BLS Survey information, reports of disabling injuries were compiled from both Form BLS 1418, "Annual Survey of Work Injuries" and Employer's Reports of Industrial Injury submitted to the State of California, Human Relations Agency, by the responding firms in the DSARC Survey. An analysis of this information provides one measure of the range of error in the enumeration of work injuries.

Part III—Evaluation and test of alternate means of collection and estimation of work injury data

In this third portion of the final report, there are two prime subjects: First, a limited analysis and evaluation of alternative resources and programs for the collection of work injury data. Second, the exposition of two statistical techniques for the estimation and projection of work injuries at the national and state levels.

Chapter Nine encompasses the first problem area in this third section of the report—the evaluation of alternative means of collection work injury and related information. In it a review and evaluation is made of selected programs in the following categories:

- a. Workmen's Compensation Programs.
- b. Federal Programs.
- c. Trade Associations.
- d. Unions.

Chapter Ten discusses the development of and test of several regression models for the protection and estimation of aggregate work injury rates for the nation. The analysis is based upon an examination of the determinates of work injury rates in conjunction with an unpublished historical series of work injury data for Manufacturing compiled by the BLS over the period from 1957 to 1966. Results of several trial projections beyond the range of data are displayed and the benefits of the approach are discussed and assessed.

Chapter Eleven displays the results of developing so-called work injury rate tables for estimating the likelihood of disabling injuries by age and sex. The approach is illustrative of an alternate estimation and projection technique that can be developed with a combination of Workmen's Compensation work injury reports and state level estimates and projections of the civilian labor force by age and sex. Supporting data used in the discussion was derived from published and unpublished information provided DSARC by the State of California, Human Relations Agency.

Part IV—Alternative strategies for improving work injury statistical programs

In this fourth and final section of the report, suggested alternative work injury programs are described and the costs of implementing them are estimated. Chapter Twelve describes, in detail, the composition of eight program options and their associated development and annual operating costs divided into federal and state shares. This latter information is provided to assist Departmental planners and others in developing long range resource and financial estimates for improving the operations of the

national work injury statistical reporting program.

- Items covered in the discussion include:
- Data Collection Programs
 - Quality Control Surveys
 - Pilot Programs
 - Cost of Work Injury Surveys

PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major conclusions

The BLS Cooperative States Annual Survey of Work Injury is the *only major* national source of information providing a broad range of coverage as to both industrial and employment detail on industrial injuries. It is the least "biased" national work injury survey of establishments currently in existence. It provides more reliable and accurate information than similar programs operated by the National Safety Council and several industrial trade associations.

However, the representativeness and validity of results and operational effectiveness of the survey is seriously restricted and impaired by the following factors.

- The virtual absence of adequate funding and manpower resources at the National, regional and state levels for effective operation of the Survey
- The inability to enforce generally accepted quality control standards on survey sampling and data collection procedures at the State level of operations
- The adherence to generally accepted standards of work injury measurement; i. e., A. N. S. I. Z-16.1, which prevents the procurement of available information which provides a more comprehensive picture of the relative hazardousness of the work environment; e. g., Serious Injury Index
- A significant lack of training of survey reporters in the treatment and handling of work injury data under the existing method of recording a measuring work injury experience—A. N. S. I. Z-6.1 Standard.
- The virtual absence of any incentives at the establishment level for the provision of job and safety training to employees which would assist in the recognition of work hazards and in reporting work injuries.
- A survey reporting universe that is representative only at the national level and is highly sensitive to changes in work injury rates due to shifts in establishment and employment coverage at the individual state level of detail.
- The total absence of complementary information at the national level on the direct and indirect economic costs of work injury.

SUPPORTING FINDINGS

Accuracy of current survey

A validation of work injuries reported to the BLS and the State of California revealed that over 36 per cent of the firms examined actually had "injuries," while reporting "no injuries" to the BLS. The effect is something in the order of an absolute error of 8 per cent in the total number of injuries reported. On a national basis this means that approximately 200,000 disabling work injuries beyond the approximately 2.2 million recorded annually are missed.

Over 93 per cent of California reporters to the BLS surveyed reported "capturing" all reports of work injuries at present. The range of missed reports as a proportion of all present reports of disabling injuries for the remaining 7 per cent was from less than two to nearly 100 per cent. Factors bearing on error in counting injuries related by these firms were:

- Difficulties in coding work injuries under the present standard.
- Non-disabling injuries that subsequently turn "disabling" and are not reported by employees.
- Foreman and supervisors who shift injured employees to less demanding jobs under the "regularly established job" criterion of A. N. S. I. Z-16.1.

Eighty and 66 per cent of California reporters to the BLS misclassified man-hours (exposure) and work injury information resulting in some minimal but unknown inflation of data submitted to the BLS.

Related to this inability to classify work injury data is the fact that 60 per cent of California reporters to the BLS surveyed had no formal and informal training in the training in the recording and reporting of work injury data.

Reinforcing this is the fact that there is slightly more than one chance out of ten that an employee entering any of the firms interviewed would receive any safety training within the first few days of employment on how job safety and health violations and work injuries are to be reported.

CONCEPT OF WORK INJURY MEASUREMENT

Fully two-thirds of California reporters had the internal resources to develop information for the construction of the "serious injury index" which combines both disabling and nondisabling injuries through reports on industrial injury submitted to State Workmen's Compensation agencies.

Information compiled for these firms in California revealed a ratio of *ten serious injuries for every disabling injury reported*. Extrapolated to the national level, this means that the current annual level of 2.5 million disabling injuries reported could rise to over 25 million "serious injuries" if this more meaningful measure of the relative hazardousness of employment were adopted.

SAMPLE COVERAGE AND REPRESENTATIVENESS

The BLS-Cooperative States Annual Survey of Work Injuries cover 148,000 establishments employing nearly one-fifth of the nation's labor force—14 million workers. It is heavily concentrated in Manufacturing, which accounts for 36 per cent of all the firms reporting but nearly two-thirds overall employment.

It is dominated by large employers—over 70 per cent of total Survey employment is concentrated in firms employing 250 or more persons, although these firms constitute less than six per cent of all reporting units.

Geographically, the Survey is very heavily concentrated in only three regions—New England, Middle Atlantic and East North Central States, which account for over three-quarters of all universe reporters and nearly two-thirds of all employment.

The Survey is thus highly dependent upon the reporting of a limited number of key states and trade association agencies for development of national estimates by detailed industry and geographic area.

Two examples illustrate this point quite clearly. Over 54.3 of Contract Construction reporters are concentrated in the Middle Atlantic States, New York State in considering dropping the Contract Construction series because of serious questions as to the validity of the information reported and the result would be a reduction in coverage of nearly 43 per cent of total reporting firms and 32 per cent of employment in Construction.

442,000 persons or 32 per cent of employment in transportation, communications and utilities in the Survey is concentrated in less than .4 per cent of all reporting units (23 establishments) in that major industry.

This information cannot be broken down on a geographic basis because 11 units, accounting for 95 per cent of the employment in that small group of reporters, submit data on a regional basis consolidating administrative, manufacturing and field operations.

Alternative data collection and estimating techniques

The BLS Survey of Work Injury could take immediate advantage of employment and man-hours information, supplied by establishments on a monthly basis from payroll records to all states under the BLS Employment Hours and Earnings or "790" program.

A test of matching employment information for California reporters to the BLS between the Survey and the 790 program indicated the possible feasibility of such an approach to the procurement of exposure information—over 70 per cent of reporting firms in the analysis could be matched. Reinforcing this are the facts that the BLS 790 Program is virtually 100 per cent federally funded, with the exception of five states, and that reports of employment and work injury survey forms can be matched through a common system of establishment identification—the U/I program employer identification number.

The ultimate solution for collection of work injury information is through a uniform national system of Workmen's Compensation industrial accident reporting. However, such a scheme is not feasible for at least a minimum of five to ten years in the future because of the lack of a national standard for accident accounting and reporting compatible with a universally accepted system of employer identification.

An analysis of workmen's compensation accident reporting systems revealed that of the 33 jurisdictions which require employers to report work injuries, only fifty per cent have data in detail sufficient for this purpose. The actual extent of usable information at present is probably restricted to no more than six key states. However, taking these deficiencies into account, a national system of work injury reporting revolving around the combination of employment "exposure" data submitted through the BLS 790 and employer reports of industrial injury—a la the State of California, would be most desirable in the long run. The system could accommodate a range of alternative work injury measurement concepts, accumulate occupational disease events, and would rely on existing sources of information for its operation.

Tests of statistical procedures for estimating work injury rates revealed that it is possible to develop an estimated national aggregate series of work injury rates on a monthly basis with a reasonable degree of accuracy. This statistical technique might be further investigated for possible adoption by the BLS as a *supplement* to the annual counts of disabling injuries.

Another statistical procedure—the so-called work injury rate table—was tested with data on the age/sex distributions of disabling injuries and the male civilian labor force for the State of California. These tests revealed a stable age profile of disabling work injuries over a ten-year period of rapid employment changes.

The results disclosed a disabling injury frequency rate for males in the labor force between the ages of 20-24 of over 2 times the value for workers in the prime years of labor force anticipation, ages 35-40. The technique demonstrated its feasibility as a tool for the estimation of the aggregate number of work injuries at both the State and federal levels.

Alternative statistical work injury programs—recommendations

In light of the above, a desirable work injury statistical program operated by the BLS would appear to have the following features:

Expanded coverage through either inclusion of additional states or expanding the number of establishments reporting in existing ones.

Consider experimental use of a "pilot" basis on employment "exposure" data submitted through the existing BLS employment and earnings "790" program.

Conduct quality control procedures along the lines of those executed in the DSARC study; i. e., validating injuries and detecting biases between responding and non-responding firms.

Experiment with expanded work injury measurement concepts such as the "serious injury index" discussed in the present study to explore the feasibility of possible adoption as a national mandatory standard.

Supplement existing annual work injury survey data with aggregate and state "statistical estimates".

Initiate a pilot program to explore the feasibility of procuring work injury data through State Workmen's Compensation accident reporting systems.

Initiate and conduct a recurring annual survey of the direct and indirect economic costs of work injury to detect the degree of efficiency afforded establishment management and labor interests through active loss prevention programs.

Fund regional BLS and State cooperating agency operations in the collection of the above information and the inclusion of states in the program to a set of performance specifications.

Consider strongly the discontinuance of trade association involvement, where feasible, in the collection of work injury data and substitute either direct reporting to BLS/Washington or indirect reporting through cooperative states.

Costs of recommendations

The estimated annual costs for adoption of a range of program options based on these recommendations fall into two categories—those revolving around the use of the existing BLS survey approach and those involving acquisition of Workmen's Compensation accident reports.

The following Table summarizes the "maximum" and "minimum" programs in each category in terms of their estimated development and annual operations costs, split between "federal" and "state" shares and program components.

In the case of the BLS Survey approach alternatives, the prerequisite programs would call for a minimum increase in annual operating costs of seven times the current level of \$225,000 annually. The maximum program alternative is over fourteen times the same figure.

The following are the contents of each alternative.

BLS survey

"Minimum" Alternative Program Contents

- Keeping the existing BLS-Cooperative States Work Injury Survey Reporting Universe at its current "response" level of 150,000 firms.
- Adding another 150,000 "responding" firms to the current survey.
- Conduct of a serious Injury Index Study and a response analysis of survey reporters.
- Implementing and operating an Annual Cost of Work Injury Survey encompassing reports derived from 15 States.

"Maximum" Alternative Program

- Adding ten states to the existing BLS—Annual Survey of Work Injury Program.
- Expanding the sample to encompass 300,000 "responding" firms nationally.
- Conducting Serious Injury Index and response analysis studies.
- Establishing a program for developing of statistical estimates of National Work Injury Experience.
- Conduct of an annual cost of Work Injury Survey in 30 States.

Workmen's compensation

"Minimum" Alternative Program Contents

- Acquisition of summary reports of Workmen's Compensation industrial accidents from 30 State programs.
- Conduct of a Serious Injury Index and response analysis studies.
- Implementing and conducting an annual cost of Work Injury Survey encompassing reports derived from 15 States.

"Maximum" Alternative Contents

- Acquisition of summary reports of Workmen's Compensation industrial accidents from all 50 state programs.
- Conduct of a serious injury index and response analysis survey.
- Establish a program for developing statistical estimate of National Work Injury Experience.
- Conduct of an annual Cost of Work Injury Survey in 30 States.

TABLE 1.—INCREMENTAL COSTS FOR ALTERNATIVE WORK INJURY STATISTICAL PROGRAMS
(In thousands of dollars)

	Initial investment cost			Annual operating cost		
	State	Federal	Total	State	Federal	Total
BLS survey:						
Maximum.....	210	230	440.0	1,825	1,205	3,030
Minimum.....	90	130	220.0	975	710	1,685
Workmen's Compensation:						
Maximum.....	102	447	549.0	200	2,090	2,290
Minimum.....	51	284	334.5	100	570	670

ACTIONS TAKEN DURING THE SECOND SESSION, 91ST CONGRESS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each session it is appropriate that we take stock of the various actions taken. Since October 15 has been decided upon as the target date for adjournment, we can now make an appraisal.

FISCAL

Based upon action already taken on annual appropriation bills, and what may be expected, it now appears the total will approximate the administration's budget requests. The Congress did better last year when it appropriated \$6 billion less than the President had recommended.

WELFARE

Closely related to the fiscal situation is the administration's welfare expansion plan, approved earlier this year by a House Republican-liberal coalition. The measure is now pending in the Senate, with the ultimate outcome in doubt.

Approval of this proposal would mean about \$5 billion additional cost for welfare, which would be added to the anticipated annual deficit, and would, of course, be highly inflationary. Estimates of the cost of this welfare bonanza range from \$4 to \$6 billion the first year, with the likelihood the increased cost would double the following year.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against that welfare expansion. As proposed, its enactment would immediately add 14 million to the present 11 million who are receiving federally financed welfare.

The proposal calls for a guaranteed annual income of \$1,600, plus \$800 in food stamps, with an agreement to seek employment. Recipients would remain on relief until they make \$3,920 a year, and in some States it would be much more.

While every right-thinking person wants to help the sick, the handicapped, and the unfortunate who are unable to help themselves, the pending proposal

A final recommendation is for the creation of an inter-agency committee comprised of representatives of the BLS, LSB, Wage and Labor Standards Administration and the Bureau of Occupational Safety and Health at U.S.H.E.W. to establish and coordinate plans and programs related to the promulgation of uniform national standards for the acquisition, processing and measurement of Work Injuries, occupational diseases, and Workmen's Compensation system operations.

would tend to lock many people into welfare as a way of life.

Moreover, once this guaranteed income is adopted as a national policy, we can be certain pressures will call for an increase in the \$1,600 minimum. Some observers regard it as a pay station on the way to the total welfare state. The American taxpayers can ill afford to shoulder this added burden.

BUSING

Mr. Speaker, another topic of major current interest is the policy, initiated by the preceding administration and being pursued by the present one, of in effect imposing compulsory busing of students away from local neighborhood schools for the sole purpose of achieving more racial mixtures of students. I am referring to schools where there is no semblance of racial discrimination, no segregation whatever.

The adverse effect of such busing applies to the parents and students of all races.

I oppose this compulsion. In reality it is an attack upon the neighborhood school concept, which is the heart and soul of our public school system.

The Congress has this year and in prior years voted against compulsory cross busing, but the Health, Education, and Welfare agency is relentless, and it gets support from lower courts.

OTHER SUBJECTS OF LEGISLATION

This Congress has tackled a number of other problems, with final action remaining on a number of bills which have been finally enacted or approved by either the House or the Senate. I will mention some of them.

Subjects covered include legislation in the fields of agriculture, crime, outer space, education, reform of the electoral college, social security, pollution, pornography, population growth, mental and other health measures, veterans legislation, housing, traffic safety, drug control, equal rights for women, postal reform, and a number of other measures of less importance.

VA HOSPITAL IN SAN ANTONIO
After a long struggle, funds were released this year for a new veterans 750-

bed \$25 million hospital, to be built in the 21st district in San Antonio. Contracts for this great project are to be let in the immediate future.

OEO AND THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. Speaker, at the request of the President the Congress extended the OEO—which includes VISTA—and the Peace Corps, at a total cost of \$2.3 billion. These programs have already cost some \$10 billion.

Regardless of their purposes, these projects include much duplication and waste, particularly in some of the metropolitan areas where OEO has received much criticism.

Because of the pending Federal deficit—now estimated at more than \$7 billion this year—and their inflationary effects, I voted against extending these programs. Any good portions could easily be salvaged and assigned to existing agencies which deal with the same subject matters, and a vast amount of money could be saved.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am pleased with the progress that has been made for national defense, although we are still lagging dangerously behind the Soviets in the rate of research and development of vital defensive and offensive weapons.

Our anti-ballistic-missile—ABM—program was approved despite opposition in the Senate to both this and other essential defense measures which had been approved in the House.

DEFENSE COSTS

Our committee has dealt with a \$71 billion defense budget this year. It sounds like a lot of money, and it is. But let us in perspective review the past for a moment.

During the decade of the 1950's defense outlays were over half of the budget—57 percent, and almost 11 percent of the gross national product—GNP.

During the 1960's defense represented 45 percent of the budget, a little less than 9 percent of the GNP.

In the current budget, authorization for defense is less than 7 percent of the GNP—even with the war in Vietnam.

In other words, while our GNP is climbing steadily toward the \$1 trillion mark, the percentage of that product being spent on national defense is steadily decreasing.

Projects designed to improve and strengthen defense training facilities in San Antonio, Del Rio, and San Angelo were approved.

THE 922D AIRLIFT RESERVE UNIT

Earlier this year the Department of Defense ordered the 922d Tactical Airlift reserve unit, headquartered at Kelly Air Force Base, disbanded. This group, including the 433d Military Airlift "Alamo" Wing, is one of the most efficient and popular in the country. In a 14-month period for example, the C-119's assigned to them logged 5,675 accident-free hours, spent 1,120 hours in support of various U.S. Army airborne forces, dropped an average of 1,400 paratroopers monthly, plus 141 tons of equipment.

This is but a part of the success story of the 922d. Superior performance gave the unit the coveted Loening Trophy which designates the outstanding flying group of the entire Air Force Reserve.

When this unit was ordered shut down, I called members of the group to Washington for a high-level conference with defense officials, then made the move in the Subcommittee on Airlift—of which I am a ranking member—and the committee strongly supported the retention of this vital training program.

Our recommendation was honored by the Secretary of Defense, the phasing out order was rescinded, and the 922d was retained—with modern equipment.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of space I shall forego further discussion of the work done during the current session. The battle against inflation, pollution, and in behalf of an adequate national defense, must be continued. And there are many other problems which beset us.

IS "MORE" BETTER?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an extremely effective, and in my opinion, truly logical commentary appeared in the September 10 Citizen, of La Grange, Ill., which makes a very valid point from the taxpayers point of view for the need for controlling sheer growth of Government.

The editorial follows:

IS "MORE" BETTER?

For far too long, the argument that "more is better" has held sway among government spenders at all levels as well as among their do-gooding, civic leader supporters.

A prime example, of course, is the public school. Of that elusive chimera, "quality education", which feeds almost exclusively on dollars, the educators told the gullible taxpayers, the more it consumed, the better the education would be afforded "our greatest natural resource", our young people.

The premise was questioned only when annual real estate tax bills grew from annoyances into economic disasters. Citizens began to ask themselves, and then the schoolmen, "Is the educational program offered today really better, in proportion to its cost, than that of 10 or 20 years ago, or is it just more expensive?"

The reaction set in swiftly, and the failure rate for tax increase referendums soared. Unhappily, the counter-move of many school boards was to refuse to believe what the public was telling them. Instead, they stoutly maintained that "more is better" and voted to borrow funds in order to support a curriculum to which all had become accustomed. (Habits, good or bad, are hard to break.)

At least at the local level, taxpayers can be and are stubborn. Repeated refusals to up the ante eventually penetrated the thickest of cranial ossifications, and costs in many districts were cut.

This meant that the seeds of further discontent, as we have observed in those school districts struck by the teaching staffs, were sown.

But painful as it is, the democratic proc-

ess sooner or later grinds out a workable compromise—at least at the grassroots level. A major question is how distance between government and governed dilutes democracy's abilities.

A bigger bugbear than local school problems is federal (and to a lesser extent, state) spending and consequent taxation. After all, it is primarily the government of the United States, chiefly in the form of the Congress, that is responsible for creating the demon of inflation.

It is good to have such institutions as the Tax foundation, which can cry out with the voice of conscience that the seductive blandishments of our representatives are largely false.

For example, don't most of us believe we are better off, financially, today than we were 10 years ago? The foundation has bad news for all of us: it found that Mr. Average, earning \$11,000 today, is no better off than he was in 1960, when he was making \$7,500. In 1960, total taxes took 23 per cent of his pay. Today that's 34 per cent. And the rest of his salary increase has been devoured by price inflation. In 1960 terms, a dollar today is worth only 77 cents.

Mr. Average's taxes, the foundation figures, have doubled in the past decade, from \$1,707 to \$3,475. Ten years ago, federal taxes took 11 per cent of his income; this year it'll be 14 per cent. Across the nation, state income taxes have risen in the same period by 161 per cent; local taxes are up 108 per cent.

On the average, we spend 40 per cent more on government than we do on food. Doubtless we get more in government services today than we did a decade ago.

But is "more" better? Your congressman won't know how you feel unless you tell him. If you have and he won't mend his ways, there is the further remedy, the ballot box (well, voting machine). Failing that, the ultimate corrective, of course, is getting involved in politics yourself, or talking a reliable friend or neighbor into running. It's already happened at the grassroots; now it's time to move up the ladder.

THE CONVERSION RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have joined more than 50 of my colleagues today in cosponsoring a piece of legislation which authorizes a far-reaching plan to involve defense and space-oriented scientists, engineers, and technicians in peacetime research and development work.

Entitled the "Conversion Research and Education Act of 1970," this measure states that "reductions in defense and space research and development must be met by corresponding increases in civilian, socially oriented research and development," and provides the following:

First, that a total of \$450 million be authorized, over a 3-year period, for specific programs of education, research, and assistance to small business firms, in order to aid in the conversion of defense research and development to civilian, socially oriented R. & D.;

Second, that the National Science Foundation sponsor research on conversion and that it develop and administer

retraining programs for scientists, engineers, technicians, and others involved in civilian R. & D.;

Third, that the Department of Commerce through the Economic Development Administration sponsor conversion retraining programs for management personnel in defense-related R. & D.;

Fourth, that the Small Business Administration assist small business firms in achieving conversion by providing

technical grants, loan guarantees, and interest assistance payments; and

Fifth, that an advisory committee of industrialists, scientists, and educators be established to help shape and guide these programs.

Defense cutbacks have posed a particular problem for many residents of Prince Georges and Charles Counties because we have such a high percentage of Department of Defense employees and

technicians employed by defense and space contractors.

This bill seeks to encourage scientists, engineers, and technicians to help solve domestic problems in such areas as health, housing, transportation, crime, and pollution. I am sure that this legislation will have a tremendous impact on those employees who have been laid off or "riffed" as a result of defense cutbacks.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 22, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are from everlasting to everlasting, whose spirit broods over Thy creation in every generation, break in upon our troubled age that men and nations may heed the divine imperative to "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thy God." We pray that in the midst of the world's crisis and confusions, its fears and frustrations, its sorrows and sufferings we may hear and heed Thy clear call guiding us to be faithful and fearless, strong and steadfast, patient and persevering under Thy sovereign grace and wisdom.

May the stern and cruel arbitrament of bomb and tank give way to peaceful adjudication, cooperation, and mutual good will.

We pray for those who bear the burdens of battle, for those who suffer from war everywhere, and especially for our own sons—prisoners of war—in distant lands. Grant them healing in sickness, courage in deprivation, and the constant awareness of Thy sustaining presence. Be with all who are dear to them that by drawing near to Thee they may be nearer to one another. Give us grace to share their burden and wisdom to labor with increased zeal for the coming peace.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Mon-

day, September 21, 1970, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. AND MRS. ARVEL GLINZ

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1216, S. 1074.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows: S. 1074, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Arvel Glinz.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1074

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Arvel Glinz of Eldridge, North Dakota, the sum of \$3,521.26, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for legal expenses paid by the said Mr. and Mrs. Arvel Glinz from March 13, 1961, through April 1, 1966, in defending the title of real property transferred to them by a receiver's deed, dated March 25, 1960, such property having been bought by the said Mr. and Mrs. Arvel Glinz at a judicial sale which was held to satisfy tax liens of the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-1199), explaining the purposes of the measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Mr. and Mrs. Arvel Glinz the sum of \$3,521.26 in full satisfaction of all

claims against the United States for reimbursement for legal expenses paid by the claimants from March 13, 1961, through April 1, 1966, in defending the title of real property transferred to them by a receiver's deed, dated March 25, 1960, such property having been bought by the claimants at a judicial sale which was held to satisfy tax liens of the United States.

STATEMENT

In 1958 the Federal Government filed a suit against Fay Heasley to collect Federal income taxes of approximately \$200,000 by foreclosing tax liens against a large farm owned by Mr. Heasley. In this suit, a judgment was entered for the Government, and Mr. Anderberg was appointed receiver by the Federal district court at Fargo, N. Dak., for the purpose of selling this farm at a judicial sale. Mr. Heasley's farm was sold by the receiver to the highest bidder who was Mr. Arvel Glinz. The Federal district court in Fargo, N. Dak., confirmed this sale and the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit upheld the sale to Mr. Glinz.

Thereafter, Mr. Fay Heasley initiated a series of suits in State and Federal courts which were repetitious and were designed to harass and embarrass Mr. Glinz in his purchase of the farm. Many of these suits were initially directed solely against Mr. Glinz in an effort to deprive him of his purchase. Such suits necessarily occasioned legal expense to Mr. Glinz, but such legal expense was private in nature as it was for the purpose of proving title in himself. Eventually, the Government, or a Government employee, was named a defendant in all of the suits. Whenever both the Government and Mr. Glinz appeared as codefendants in one of these suits, the Government undertook to defend the suit, to the mutual benefit of the United States and Mr. Glinz, thereby relieving Mr. Glinz of any additional expense. However, the Government did not and could not pay those expenses incurred by Mr. Glinz in the hiring of his personal attorney as that attorney only represented and advised Mr. Glinz.

In a letter to the Honorable Quentin N. Burdick, the Assistant Attorney General stated as follows:

"It is these legal fees which Mr. Glinz incurred for his private benefit which are the subject of the private bill proposed by Mr. Anderberg. It is self-evident, from the foregoing factual summary, that such private legal expenses cannot be paid by the Government. It should be pointed out that the Department of Justice has, in the past, been quick to intervene and assume the burden of any litigation in such matters where it could justifiably do so in the interest of protecting purchasers at Government tax foreclosure sales."

A copy of the letter of the Assistant Attorney General is attached hereto and made a part hereof. Also attached is a letter from Henry W. Anderberg to Senator Burdick which sets forth further facts in relation to this matter. The Anderberg letter also relates